LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 6 1961
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BT 755 .K54
King, John J.
The necessity of the church
for salvation in selected

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 6 1961
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BT 755 .K54
King, John J.
The necessity of the church
for salvation in selected

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/necessityofchurc00king

THE NECESSITY OF THE CHURCH FOR SALVATION IN SELECTED THEOLOGICAL WRITINGS OF THE PAST CENTURY

This dissertation was conducted under the direction of Right Reverend Joseph C. Fenton, S.T.D., as major professor and was approved by Reverend Edmond D. Benard, Ph.D., S.T.D., and Reverend Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D., as readers.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
P 29 1960
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
STUDIES IN SACRED THEOLOGY
(SECOND SERIES)
No. 115

The Necessity of the Church for Salvation in Selected Theological Writings of the Past Century

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF SACRED THEOLOGY OF THE
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY

BY

REV. JOHN J. KING, O.M.I., S.T.L.

PRIEST OF THE EASTERN PROVINCE
OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE OBLATES OF MARY IMMACULATE

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1960

IMPRIMI POTEST:

RAYMUND J. HUNT, O.M.I., PH.D.
Superior Provincialis
Bostonii, die 5 Maii, 1959

NIHIL OBSTAT:

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON, S.T.D.
Censor Deputatus

IMPRIMATUR:

PATRICK A. O'BOYLE
Archiepiscopus Washingtonensis
Washingtonii, D. C., die 23 Maii, 1959

Copyright 1960
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS, INC.

MURRAY AND HEISTER, INC.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRINTED BY
TIMES AND NEWS PUBLISHING CO.
GETTYSBURG, PA., U. S. A.

TO MARY IMMACULATE, QUEEN OF OUR
RELIGIOUS FAMILY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION xi

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xvii

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY xix

PART I

THE DOCTRINE IN THE LATTER PART OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER

I. PRIOR TO THE VATICAN COUNCIL 3
  1. The Theologians 3
  2. The Statements of Pope Pius IX 15
  3. Summary 28

II. THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND ITS AFTERMATH 30
  1. The Council 30
  2. Post-Conciliar Authors 33
  3. Summary 55

III. THE END OF THE CENTURY 58
  1. Explanation of Cardinal Franzelin 58
  2. Authors from Franzelin to Dublanchy 66
  3. Edmund Dublanchy 77
  4. Summary 85

PART II

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

IV. THE EARLY PART OF THE CENTURY 91
  1. Authors from Dublanchy to Hugon 91
  2. Edouard Hugon 108
  3. Summary 113

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER PAGE

V. THE INFLUENCE OF CAPERAN AND BAINVEL 116
1. Authors from Hugon to Caperan 116
2. Caperan 119
3. Bainvel 131
4. Summary 139

VI. FROM CAPERAN TO ADAM 141
1. Authors from Caperan to Adam 141
2. Adam 160
3. Summary 168

VII. FROM ADAM TO CONGAR 170
1. Authors from Adam to Congar 170
2. Karrer 188
3. Summary 198

VIII. FROM CONGAR TO THE ENCYCLICAL MYSTICI CORPORIS 200
1. Congar 200
2. De Lubac 219
3. Authors from de Lubac to the Encyclical 228
4. Summary 245

PART III

THE PONTIFICATE OF POPE PIUS XII

IX. THE ENCYCLICAL MYSTICI CORPORIS AND ITS EFFECTS 251
1. The Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* 251
2. Post-Encyclical Writings 255
3. Summary 286

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER PAGE

X. THE DOCTRINE IN RECENT THEOLOGY 289
  1. *Humani Generis* 289
  2. *Suprema Haec Sacra* 291
  3. Theologians 295
  4. Summary 338

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 340
  1. General Summary 340
  2. Conclusions 359

INDEX OF NAMES 361

INTRODUCTION

The magnificent advances made in theology during the last one hundred years are nowhere more in evidence than in ecclesiology. The present day treatises of Mors, Salaverri, and Zapelena bear little resemblance to that of John Perrone written in 1840. Ecclesiology, aided by the guidance of the magisterium, has elaborated a profound understanding of the nature of Christ's Church. From Moehler, Murray, and Franzelin to Congar, Tromp, and Zapelena there has been an ever-deepening appreciation of the grandeur and of the mystery which is the Church of Christ.

Central to any treatment of the Church is the doctrine which declares that "outside the Church there is no salvation." This much-abused and oft-misunderstood doctrine of the Church's necessity expresses the very purpose of the Church's existence: the return of man to God through Christ.

The present study attempts to trace in detail the history of this doctrine throughout the development of the past one hundred years. Its aim is to determine what elements have been established as absolutely necessary to an adequate explanation; what elements have been rejected as erroneous or inadequate, and what facets of this complex doctrine still require further theological precision. If this study is to have any measure of success, it will have to be subjected to many limitations. No one could attempt an exhaustive examination of the ecclesiological literature of the past one hundred years. Therefore attention has been directed primarily to those theological works which have either signaled a new direction given the doctrine, or which are representative of a particular theological view. Many books highly important to the ecclesiology of the recent past will find no mention here; not because they are lightly valued, but because their influence upon the doctrine of the Church's necessity has been, at most, remote. Preference has been given to works in Latin and French since it is here that the main stream of theological development is found. Furthermore, examination of several very important works (such as L. Caperan's *Le* *problème de salut des infidèles*) has been confined to the specific area involving the role of the Church in man's attainment of salvation. A large number of manualists—or school theologians—are included in this study. Since the Vatican Council they have borne most of the weight of theological tradition.

The expansion of ecclesiology has been at times a stormy one which has called forth frequent statements from the magisterium. The present study has considered it one of its primary aims to determine the particular orientation given by the principal magisterial documents of Popes Pius IX and Pius XII. Special emphasis is placed upon the letter of the Holy Office to the Archbishop of Boston on August 8, 1949. This letter is the most detailed explanation of the Church's necessity which has been given in an official document. The pertinent portion of the letter is given here.

> Now, in the first place, the Church teaches that in this matter there is question of a most strict command of Jesus Christ. For He explicitly enjoined on His apostles to teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever He Himself had commanded (Matt. 28:19-20).
>
> Now, among the commandments of Christ, that one holds not the least place, by which we are commanded to be incorporated by Baptism into the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, and to remain united to Christ and to His Vicar, through whom He Himself in a visible manner governs the Church on earth.
>
> Therefore, no one will be saved who, knowing the Church to have been divinely established by Christ, nevertheless refuses to submit to the Church or withholds obedience from the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth.
>
> Not only did the Saviour command that all nations should enter the Church, but He also decreed the Church to be a means of salvation, without which no one can enter the kingdom of eternal glory.
>
> In His infinite mercy God has willed that the effects, necessary for one to be saved, of those helps to salvation, which are directed toward man's final end, not by intrinsic necessity, but only by divine institution, can also be obtained in certain circumstances when those helps are used only in *desire* and *longing*. This we see

clearly stated in the Sacred Council of Trent, both in reference to the Sacrament of Regeneration and in reference to the Sacrament of Penance (Denzinger, nn. 797, 807).

The same in its own degree must be asserted of the Church, in as far as she is the general help to salvation. Therefore, that one may obtain eternal salvation, it is not always required that he be incorporated into the Church *actually* as a member, but it is necessary that at least he be united to her by *desire* and *longing*.

However, this desire need not always be explicit, as it is in catechumens; but when a person is involved in invincible ignorance, God accepts also an *implicit desire,* so called because it is included in that good disposition of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God.

These things are clearly taught in that dogmatic letter which was issued by the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius XII on June 29, 1943, "On the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ" (*AAS,* Vol. 35, an. 1943, p. 193 ff.). For in this letter the Sovereign Pontiff clearly distinguishes between those who are *actually* incorporated into the Church as members, and those who are united to the Church only *by desire.*

Discussing the members of which the Mystical Body is composed here on earth, the same August Pontiff says: "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed."

Toward the end of this same Encyclical Letter, when most affectionately inviting to unity those who do not belong to the body of the Catholic Church, he mentions those who "are related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by a certain unconscious *yearning* and *desire,*" and these he by no means excludes from eternal salvation, but on the other hand states that they are in a condition "in which they cannot be sure of their salvation" since "they still remain deprived of those many heavenly gifts and helps which can only be enjoyed in the Catholic Church" (*AAS, loc. cit.* 243).

With these wise words he reproves both those who exclude from eternal salvation all united to the Church *only by implicit desire,* and those who falsely assert that men can be saved equally well in every religion (cf. Pope

> Pius IX, Allocution "Singulari quadam," in Denzinger, nn. 1641 ff., also Pope Pius IX, in the Encyclical Letter, "Quanto conficiamur moerore" in Denzinger, n. 1677).
>
> But it must not be thought that any kind of desire of entering the Church suffices that one may be saved. It is necessary that the desire by which one is related to the Church be animated by perfect charity. Nor can an implicit desire produce its effect, unless a person has supernatural faith: "For he who comes to God must believe that God exists and is a rewarder of those who seek Him" (Hebrews, 11:6). The Council of Trent declares (Session VI, chap. 8): "Faith is the beginning of Man's salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God and attain to the fellowship of His Children" (Denzinger, n. 801).[1]

This then is the Church's understanding of the doctrine of her necessity for salvation. It may be summarized thus: the Church is necessary with both the necessity of means and of precept. Some union with the Church is an absolutely necessary prerequisite for salvation; a man need not always be incorporated "actually as a member, but it is necessary that at least he be united to her by desire and longing." This desire may be either explicit or implicit. Thus the Roman Catholic Church must exercise a causal influence in every case where an individual attains salvation. Furthermore, adequate explanation of the Church's necessity depends upon a clear understanding of the concepts of member and Church as well as a recognition of the fact that the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ are identical. Hence they cannot be given unequal extensions.

It is this view of the doctrine which will hereafter be called the traditional view and it is this traditional view which will be used as the criterion for evaluating the explanations of the theologians. Since the role of the magisterium in any development is at least normative; and since it is in fact "the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians,"[2] there is no need to apologize for employing a methodology which measures the adequacy of theological exposition by the authoritative statements of the magisterium. If there is a theological insecurity which proceeds from a mistrust of speculation and seeks refuge in an "excessive attachment" to authoritative statements, there is also a very real pseudo-intellectual disdain for authoritative statements. This latter tendency has its origin in subjectivism.

---

[1] See below, 291 ff.

[2] Pius XII, *Humani generis, AAS* 42, 568. Eng. tr.: *Humani Generis* (Washington N.C.W.C., 1959) 9.

This study should not be construed as a post-factum condemnation of theological works on the basis of documents to which older authors had no access. It is rather an evaluation of tentatives to which time and official statements have affixed varying degrees of acceptability.

There is need for ecclesiology to take stock of the vigorous, sometimes headstrong progress of the past century. There is need to weigh carefully the precisions of the magisterium in order to sort out from the legitimate progress those elements which are inadequate. This will serve to solidify the progress made and guard against recurrence of old errors—or the introduction of new ones. It will ensure true theological progress and not merely the substitution of new errors for old truths. The present study attempts to do this for one doctrine, the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation.

The writer wishes to thank the Very Reverend Raymond J. Hunt, O.M.I., Ph.D., Provincial of the Eastern Province of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, for the opportunity to pursue graduate studies in the field of Sacred Theology. He is grateful to the Most Reverend Leo Deschatelets, O.M.I., Superior General and to Very Reverend Father Hunt for the opportunity of extending his research to the University centers in Rome, Fribourg, Louvain and Paris. The writer also wishes to thank Right Reverend Joseph C. Fenton, S.T.D., for his thorough guidance and for his constant and enthusiastic encouragement. The writer is also much indebted to Reverend Edmond D. Benard, Ph.D., S.T.D., and to the Reverend Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D., for reading the manuscript and for their valuable suggestions and corrections.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAS	*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*
AER	*American Ecclesiastical Review*
AT	*L'année théologique*
CM	*Collectanea Mechliniensia*
DTC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*
EV	*Eglise vivant*
IER	*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*
ITQ	*Irish Theological Quarterly*
NRT	*Nouvelle revue theologique*
RchSR	*Rescherches des sciences religieuses*
RSPT	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologique*
RSR	*Revue des sciences religieuses*
TS	*Theological Studies*

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Theological Books

Adam, K., *Das Wesen des Katholizismus,* 7 ed. Dusseldorf 1934.

Anger, J., *La doctrine du corps mystique de Jesus Christ,* Paris 1929.

Anouilh, P., *Tractatus de vera ecclesia Christi,* Appamiis 1889.

Aubert, R., *Le pontificat de Pie IX,* Paris 1952.

———, *La théologie catholique au milieu de XXᵉ siecle,* Paris 1954.

Bainvel, J. V., *De ecclesia Christi,* Paris 1925.

———, *Hors de l'église pas de salut,* Paris 1913.

Baisi, S. C., *Institutiones theologiae scholasticae,* 3 vols., Milan 1948.

Barbier, E., *Histoire du catholicisme liberal et du catholicisme social en France,* 6 vols., Bordeaux 1924.

Bartmann, B., *Précis de théologie dogmatique.* Trans. by Marcel Gautier, Mulhouse 1936.

Battifol, P., *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin,* Paris 1920.

Bauduin, L., *Eglise et unité,* Lille 1948.

Beni, A., & Cipriani, S., *La vera chiesa,* Florence 1953.

Berry, S., *The Church of Christ,* St. Louis 1927.

Berthier, J., *Compendium dogmaticae et moralis,* 4 ed., Paris 1898.

Besson, Mg., *L'église—oeuvre de l'Homme Dieu,* 17 ed., Paris 1918.

Billot, L., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* 2 vols., Prati 1910.

Blanch, M., *Theologiae generalis seu tractatus de sacrae theologiae principiis,* Barcelona 1901.

Bonal, A., *Institutiones theologicae,* 18 ed., Toulose 1893.

Bougaud, E., *Le Christianisme et les temps presents,* 5 vols., Paris 1882.

Bouillat, J., *L'église catholique,* Paris 1902.

Boulenger, A., *Manuel d'apologetique,* Paris 1920.

Bousquet, J., *L'unité de l'église et le schisme grec,* Paris 1913.

Braun, F., *Aspects noveau du problème de l'eglise,* Paris 1941.

Briere, Yves de la, *L'église et son gouvernment,* Paris 1935.

———, *Les luttes presentes de l'église,* 3 vols., Paris 1909.

Brouwer, F., de, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* Brugis 1881.

Brugere L., *De ecclesia Christi,* Paris 1873.

Brunhes, G., *Christianisme et catholicisme,* 3 ed., Paris 1924.

———, *La foi et sa justification rationnele,* Paris 1928.

Buysse, P., *L'église de Jesus,* Paris 1924.

Calcagno, F. X., *Theologia fundamentalis,* Naples 1948.

Caperan, L., *Le problème du salut des infidèles.* 2 vols., Paris 1912.

Carlen, Sr. M. Claudia, *A Guide to the Encyclicals of the Roman Pontiffs from Leo XIII to the Present Day (1878-1937),* New York 1939.

Carrigan, J., *Body and Soul of the Church,* London (Ontario) 1946.

Casajoana, V., *Disquisitiones scholastico-dogmaticae,* Barcelona 1888.

Cassanova, G., *Theologiae fundamentalis,* Rome 1899.

Castelein, A., *Le rigorisme, le nombre des élus et la doctrine du salut,* 2 ed., Brussels 1899.

Cercia, R., *Demonstratio catholica sive tractatus de ecclesia vera,* Paris 1848.

Cerfaux, L., *La théologie de l'église suivant saint Paul,* Paris 1948.

Chere, J., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* Laedonensi 1884.

Clerissac, H., *Le mystère de l'église,* Paris 1918.

Congar, M. J., *Chrétiens désunis, Principes d'un oecuménisme catholique.* Paris 1937.

———, Esquisses du mystère de l'église, Paris 1941.

Coppin, P., *La question de l'Evangile: "Seigneur, y en aura-t-il peu de sauvés?" ou considerations sur l'écrit du R. P. Castelein intitulé:* "Le rigorisme et la question du nombre des élus." Brussels 1899.

Corbishley, T., *Roman Catholicism,* London 1950.

Cotter, A., *Theologia fundamentalis,* Weston, Mass. 1940.

———, *The Encyclical "Humani Generis,"* Weston, Mass. 1952.

Cristiani, L., *Pages doctrinales. Jesus-Christ et l'église,* Paris 1914.

Crosta, Clino, *Theologia dogmatica,* Gallarate 1897.

Dallavalle, N., *La chiesa,* Parma 1951.

Danielou, J., *Le mystère du salut des nations.* Paris 1946.

David, G., *Theologia dogmatica generalis,* Lyon 1893.

Dechamps, V., *Entretiens sur la demonstration catholique,* Malines 1861.

Decluve, G., *L'église, notre mere,* Paris 1944.

Delogne, H., *Notre credo vecu,* Paris 1939.

Denis, L., *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae,* Braine-la-Comte (Belgique) 1950.

Desers, L., *L'église catholique.* Paris 1902.

Dieckmann, H., *Tractatus historico-dogmatici de ecclesia,* Friburgi Brisgoviae 1925.

Diekamp, F., & Hoffman, A., *Theologiae dogmaticae manuale,* Paris 1933.

Dorsch, A., *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis,* Innsbruch 1914.

Dublanchy, E., *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus,* Bar-le-duc 1895.

Duchesne, L., *L'église séparé,* Paris 1905.

Dumont, C. J., *Les voies de l'unité chrètienne,* Paris 1954.

Dumont, P., "L'église et les églises," in *Qu'est-ce que l'orthodoxie—vues catholique,* Brussels 1944.

Duplessy, E., *La constitution de l'église,* Paris 1924.

Egger, F., *Enchridion theologiae dogmaticae generalis,* Brixinae 1888.

Falcon, J., *La credibilité du dogme catholique,* Paris 1933.

Fei, R., *Propaedeutica sive questiones praeambulae ad sacram theologiam,* Florence 1910.

Felder, H., *Apologetica sive theologia fundamentalis,* Paderbonae 1920.

Fenton, J. C., *The Catholic Church and Salvation,* Westminster (Maryland) 1958.

Fraghi, S., *De membris ecclesiae,* Rome 1937.

Franzelin, J. B., Theses de ecclesia Christi, Rome 1887.

Gardeil, A., *La credibilité d'apologetique,* Paris 1928.

Garrigou-Lagrange, R., *De revelatione per ecclesiam catholicam proposita,* 5 ed., Rome 1950.

Gigon, A., *De membris ecclesiae Christi,* Friburgi, Helvetiorum 1949.

Goupil, A., *L'église,* Paris 1929.

Gousset, *Théologie dogmatique,* 15 ed., Paris 1892.

Goyau, G., *Le catholicisme,* Paris 1931.

Grea, D. S., *De l'église et de sa divine constitution,* Paris 1885.

de Groot, J. V., *Summa apologetica de ecclesia,* Ratisbone 1890.

Gruden, J., *The Mystical Christ,* St. Louis 1938.

Guerry, E., *Dans le Christ total.* Paris 1952.

de Guibert, J., *De Christi ecclesia,* Rome 1926.

Gutti, V., *Institutiones apologetico-polemicae de veritate ac divinitate religionis et ecclesiae catholicae,* Rome 1867.

Hales, E. E. Y., *Pio Nono,* N. Y. 1954.

Hallett, P., *What Is Catholicity?* N. Y. 1955.

Hasseveldt, R., *The Church: A Divine Mystery.* Trans. by A. LaMothe, Chicago 1954.

d'Herbigny, M., *Theologica de ecclesia,* Paris 1927.

Heris, C., *L'église du Christ, son sacerdoce, son gouvernement,* Seine-et-Oise 1930.

Hermann, J., *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae,* 7 ed., Lyons 1937.

Herve, J., *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae,* Paris 1914.

Hettinger, F., *Apologie des Christenthums,* 5 vols. 7 ed., Freiburg i. Br. 1897.

Hocedez, E., *Histoire de la théologie au XIX^{e} siecle,* 3 vols., Paris 1952.

Holstein, H., & Boumard, D., *L'église, corps vivant du Christ,* 2 ed., Paris 1951.

Horvath, A., *Synthesis theologia fundamentalis,* Budapest 1947.

Hugon, E., *Hors de l'église point de salut,* Paris 1907.

Hugueny, E., *Critique et catholique,* Paris 1910.

Hunter, S., *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology,* 4 vols., N. Y. 1894.

Hurter, H., *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium,* Innsbruch 1876.

Hurtevent, S., *L'unité de l'église du Christ,* Paris 1930.

Jaki, S., *Les tendances nouvelles de l'ecclesiologie,* Rome 1957.

Jansen, G. M., *Praelectiones theologiae fundamentalis,* Ultrajecti 1875.

Journet, C., *L'église du Verbe Incarné,* 2 vols., Paris 1941-51.

Jugie, M., *Où se trouve le christianisme intégral,* Paris 1947.

Karrer, O., *Religions of Mankind.* Trans. by E. I. Watkin, N. Y. 1936.

Kosters, L., *L'église de notre foi.* Trans. by A. Mozayer, Paris 1938.

Labeyrie, C., *La science de la foi,* Le Chappele-Montiligeon 1903.

Labourdette, M., *Foi catholique et problèms modernes,* Tournai 1953.

Labourt, J., *Cours superieur d'instruction religieuse,* 3 ed., Paris 1909.

Lahargou, P., *L'église et ses temoins dans le monde,* Paris 1927.

———, *Nouveau cours d'apologétique,* Paris 1927.

Lahitton, J., *Theologiae dogmaticae theses juxta sinceram D. Thomae doctrinam,* 4 vols. 2 ed., Paris 1932.

Lambrecht, H., *Demonstratio catholica seu tractatus de ecclesia,* Ghent 1890.

Laxenaire, J., *Within and Without the Church.* Trans by J. M. Leleu, St. Louis 1904.

Leboucher, A., *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi,* Paris 1877.

Lecanuet, E., *Montalembert,* 3 vols., Paris 1902.

Leclercq, J., *Meditations sur l'église,* Louvain 1926.

———, *La vie du Christ dans son église,* Paris 1947.

Lepicier, A., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* Rome 1935.

Lercher, L., & Schalagenhaufen, F., *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae,* vol. 1, 5 ed., Barcelona, 1951.

Lesetre, H., *La foi catholique,* 11 ed., Paris 1909.

Liégé, P. A., "Le mystere de l'eglise," *Initiation theologique,* vol. 4, Paris 1954.

Lippert, P., *Die Kirche Christi,* Freiburg i. Br. 1931.

Lombardi, R., *La salvezza di chi non ha fede,* 4 ed., Rome 1949.

de Lubac, H., *Catholicisme,* Paris 1938.

———, *Meditation sur l'église,* Paris 1953.

Lutz, A. J., *Jesus-Christ et les protestants,* Paris 1939.

MacGuinness, J., *Commentarii theologici,* Paris 1930.

Magnasco, S., *Institutiones theologiae,* 4 vols., Genuae 1876.

de Mandato, P., *Questiones aliquot de veraereligionis seu ecclesiae Christi credibilitate et natura,* Rome 1896.

Mannens, P., *Theologiae dogmaticae institutiones,* Ruraemundae 1901.

Manzoni, C., *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae,* 4 ed., Turin 1928.

Marchini, A., *Summula theologiae dogmaticae,* Mortariae-Biglebani 1898.

Marengo, J., *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis,* 3 ed., Augustae Taur 1894.

Marotte, L. P., *Cours complet d'instruction chretienne,* 8 ed., Paris 1875.

Masl, M., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* Paris 1928.

Mathew, A. H., ed., *Ecclesia: The Church of Christ,* N. Y. 1906.

Mathieu, H., *Quelle est la veritable religion?* Paris 1934.

Mazzella, C., *De religione et ecclesia,* Prati 1880.

Mazzella, H., *Praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae,* 6 ed., Turin 1904.

Mendive, P., *Institutiones theologiae dogmatico-scholasticae,* Vallisoleti 1895.

Mersch, E., *Le corps mystique du Christ,* 2 vols., Louvain 1933.

Michelitsch, A., *Elementa apologeticae sive theologiae fundamentalis,* Graz 1925.

Minges, P., *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae generalis,* 2 ed., 1923.

Moillot, H., *L'église de Jesus,* Paris 1933.

de Montcheuil, Yves, *Aspects de l'église,* Paris 1949.

Morere, B., *Noveau manuel d'apologétique chrètienne,* Paris 1884.

Mors, J., *Theologia fundamentalis,* 2 vols., Buenis Aeris 1955.

Muller, M., *God the Teacher of Mankind,* St. Louis 1889.

Muncunill, J., *Tractatus de Christi ecclesia,* Barcelona 1914.

Murphy, J., *The Living Christ,* Milwaukee 1952. 2 ed., 1956.

Murray, P., *De ecclesia,* 3 vols., Dublin 1860.

Naulerts, J., *De ecclesia Christi,* Mechliniae 1913.
Negre, A., *Cursus theologiae dogmaticae,* vol. 1, Mimati 1896.
Newman, J. H., *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk,* N. Y. 1875.
Orain, *Cours d'apologétique chrètienne,* Blois 1896.
Ottiger, I., *Theologia fundamentalis,* 2 vols., Friburgi Brisgoviae 1911.
Palmieri, D., *Tractatus de romano pontifice,* Prati 1877.
Parente, P., *Theologia fundamentalis,* 2 ed., Rome 1947.
Paris, G., *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* Melitae 1929.
Perreyve, H., *Entretiens sur l'église catholique,* Paris 1864.
Perriot, F., *Praelectiones theologiae dogmaticae,* Lingonensis 1876.
Perrone, J., *Praelectiones theologicae,* vol. 1, Rome 1840.
Pesch, C., *Praelectiones dogmaticae,* 6-7 ed., Freiburgi Brisgoviae 1924.
Philips, G., *Le sainte église catholique,* Paris 1947.
Pinard de la Boullaye, H., *L'etude comparée des religions,* 2 vols., Paris 1925.
Pollet, R., *Ecclesiologia seu de ecclesia catholica tractatus,* Rome 1935.
de Poulipiquet, A., *L'eglise catholique,* Paris 1923.
Prevel, P., *Theologiae dogmaticae elementa,* Paris 1912.
Prunel, L., *L'eglise,* 16 ed., 1919.
Rabeau, G., *Apologetique,* Paris 1930.
Reinerding, F., *Theologia fundamentalis,* Monasterii Guestphalorum 1864.
Reinhold, G., *Praelectiones de theologia fundamentali,* 2 vols., Viennae 1905.
Rudloff, L., *Petite theologie dogmatique,* Paris 1938.
Ruiz, V., *Theologiae fundamentalis,* Burgos 1906.
Russo, N., *The True Religion and its Dogmas,* Boston 1886.
St. John, H., *Essays in Christian Unity,* Westminster 1955.
Sala, F., *Institutiones positivo-scholasticae theologiae dogmaticae,* vol. 1, 5 ed., Milan 1899.
Salaverri, J., & Nicolau, M., *Sacra theologiae summa,* vol. 1, Madrid 1955.
de San, L., *Tractatus de ecclesia et romano pontifice,* Burgis 1906.
Schanz, P., *A Christian Apology.* Trans. by M. Glancey & V. Schobel, N. Y. 1902.
Schiffini, S., *De vera religione seu de Christi ecclesia,* Senis 1908.
Schouppe, F., *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae,* 22 ed., Paris 1867.
Schrader, C., *De unitate romana,* Friburgi Brisgoviae 1862.
Schultes, P., *De ecclesia catholica,* Paris 1926.
Segna, F., *De ecclesia Christi,* Rome 1900.
Sertillanges, A., *L'église,* Paris 1916.
Souben, J., *Nouvelle théologie dogmatique,* Paris 1905.
Stoltz, A., *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae,* Friburgi Brisgoviae 1939.
Straub, A., *De ecclesia Christi,* Innsbruck 1890.
Stummer, A., *Manuale theologiae fundamentalis,* Innsbruck 1907.
Tanquerey, A., *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae,* Paris 1896.
Tepe, B., *Institutiones theologiae,* Paris 1894.
Texier, A., *Precis d'apologétique,* Paris 1939.
Thils, G., *Histoire doctrinale du movement oecumenique,* Louvain 1955.
———, *Orientations de la théologie,* Louvain 1958.

Van Laak, H., *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis,* Prati 1911.

Van Noort, G., & Verhaar, J., *De ecclesia Christi,* 5 ed., Hilversum 1932.

———, *Christ's Church.* Trans. and Rev. by J. Castelot & W. Murphy, Westminster (Maryland) 1957.

Vellico, P., *De ecclesia Christi,* Rome 1940.

Verhelst, M., *Dogmatique,* Brussels 1918.

Vives, J., *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae,* Rome 1905.

Vonier, A., *The Spirit and the Bride,* London 1920.

Walker, L., *The Problem of Reunion,* London 1920.

Watkin, E. I., *The Catholic Center,* N. Y. 1939.

———, "The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ," *God and the Supernatural,* London 1920.

Wilhelm, J., & Scannell, T., *A Manual of Catholic Theology,* 2 ed., London 1901.

Wilmers, W., *De christi ecclesia,* Ratisbonae 1897.

Zapelena, T., "De actuali statu ecclesiologiae," *Analecta Gregoriana,* vol. 68, series fac. theol. Sectio A, n. 11, Rome 1954.

———, *De ecclesia Christi,* 2 vols., Rome 1954-55.

Zigliara, T., *Propaedeutica ad sacram theologiam,* 5 ed., Rome 1903.

Zubizarreta, V., *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica,* 4 vols., Bilbao 1937.

II. Periodical Literature

Armstrong, A., "Membership of the Church," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 8 (1949) 231-240.

Aubert, R., "De praecipuis tendentiis ecclesiologiae hodiernae," *CM* 36 (1951) 599-603.

———, "De praecipuis interventibus Pii Papae XII quoad doctrinam de ecclesia," *CM* 37 (1952), 39-43.

———, "De notione catholicitatis ecclesiae," *CM* 35 (1950), 695-697.

Besson, Mgr., "L'appartenance invisible au Royaume de Dieu," *Revue Apologetique* 64 (1937), 385-401.

Bluett, J., "'Mystical Body of Christ' and 'Catholic Church' Exactly Co-extensive," *AER* 103 (1940) 305-328.

Boat, W., "Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus," *AER* 107 (1942) 291-296.

Bouyer, L., "Où en est la théologie du Corps mystique," *RSR* 22 (1948) 312-333.

Chavasse, A., "L'église dans son mystère et dans son histoire," *Masses Ouvrieres* 50 (Dec. 1949) 95-150.

———, "Ordonnés au Corps mystique . . . ," *NRT* 70 (1948) 690-702.

Chavasse, A., Denis, H., & Frisque, J., "La croissance temporelle de l'église," *EV* 5 (1953) 188-206.

Congar, M. J., "Bulletin d'ecclesiologie," *RSPT* 31 (1947) 77-96; 272-296.

———, "Bulletin d'ecclesiologie," *RSPT* 34 (1950) 648-655.

———, "The Idea of Church in St. Thomas," *The Thomist* I (1939) 331-359.

Connell, F., "An Important Roman Instruction," *AER* 122 (1950) 321-330.

———, "Recent Dogmatic Theology," *AER* 110 (1944) 131-137.

———, "Recent Dogmatic Theology. An Approach to Compromise," *AER* 112 (1945) 119-129.

———, "Theological Content of Humani Generis," *AER* 123 (1950) 321-330.

Courtade, G., "J. B. Franzelin—les formules que le magistere de l'église lui a empruntés," *RchSR* 40 (1951-52) 317-325.

Desers, L., "Hors de l'église, point de salut," *Revue Pratique d'Apologetique* 1 (1905) 123-127.

Durand, A., "Qu'est-ce que l'église?" *NRT* 73 (1951) 912-925.

Fenton, J., "The Act of the Mystical Body," *AER* 100 (1939) 397-408.

———, "An Accusation Against School Theology," *AER* 110 (1944) 213-222.

———, "The Extension of Christ's Mystical Body," *AER* 110 (1944) 124-130.

———, "Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus," *AER* 110 (1944) 300-306.

———, "Father Journet's Concept of the Church," *AER* 127 (1952) 370-380.

———, "The Holy Office Letter on the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER* 127 (1952) 450-461.

———, "The Humani Generis and its Predecessors," *AER* 123 (1950) 452-458.

———, "The Lesson of Humani Generis," *AER* 123 (1950) 359-378.

———, "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation," *AER* 124 (1951) 124-143; 203-221; 290-302.

———, "Membership in the Church," *AER* 112 (1945) 287-305.

———, "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER* 118 (1948) 214-228; 290-305; 361-375.

———, "The Use of the Terms Body and Soul with Reference to the Catholic Church," *AER* 110 (1944) 48-57.

Frisque, J., "Hors de l'église, il n'y a pas de salut," *EV* 7 (1955) 98-107.

Garrigou-Lagrange, R., "La nouvelle théologie, où va-t-elle?" *Angelicum* 23 (1946) 126-145.

Goeyvaerts, J., "De membris Corporis Christi Mystici," *CM* 29 (1940-44) 407-411.

Gribomont, J., "Du sacrement de l'église et de ses relisations imparfaites," *Irenikon* 22 (1949) 345-367.

de Guibert, J., "Quelle a été la pensée definitive de S. Thomas sur le salut des infidèles?" *Bull. de Litt. Eccel. de Toulouse* 5 (1913) 337-355.

Hamell, P., "No Salvation Outside the Church," *IER* Sept. 1957, 145-161.

———, "Humani Generis, Its Significance and Teaching," *IER* 75 (1951) 289.

Holstein, H., "Le Christ Tête de tous les hommes," *AT* 11 (1950) 22-31.

———, "Problems théologiques. Eglise et corps du Christ," *Etudes* 267 (1950) 241-252.

———, "La théologie fondamentale depuis 1945," *AT* 11 (1950) 133-161.

Hughes, H., "The Mystical Body," *AER* 72 (1925) 225-233.

Hugon, E., "Le salut des païens," *Revue Thomiste* 5 (1905) 381-397.

Labourdette, M., "Les enseignements de l'encyclique Humani Generis," *Revue Thomiste* 50 (1950) 32-55.

Levie, J., "L'encyclique 'Humani Generis,'" *NRT* 82 (1950) 785-793.

Lialine, C., "Une étape en ecclesiologie: reflexions sur l'encyclique Mystici Corporis," *Irénikon* 19 (1946) 129-152; 283-317; 20 (1947) 34-54.

Liege, P. A., "Le salut des 'autres,'" *Lumiere et Vie* 18 (Nov. 1954) 13-50.

———, "L'appartenenace a l'église et l'encyclique 'Mystici Corporis,'" *RSPT* 32 (1948) 351-358.

MacGuiness, I., "Mystici Corporis and the Soul of the Church," *The Thomist* 1 (1948) 18-27.

Malevez, L., "Quelques enseignements de l'encyclique 'Mystici Corporis Christi,'" *NRT* 67 (1945) 993-1015.

Malvy, P. A., "Les dissidents de bonne foi sont-ils membres de l'eglise?" *RchSR* 17 (1927) 29-35.

Mitchell, G., "Humani Generis and Theology," *ITQ* 19 (1952) 1-16.

Morel, V., "Le corps mystique du Christ et l'église catholique," *NRT* 80 (1948) 703-726.

Nicolas, M. J., "Théologie de l'église," *Revue Thomiste* 46 (1946) 372-398.

Nothomb, D. M., "L'église et le Corps mystique du Christ," *Irénikon* 25 (1952) 226-248.

O'Connell, J., "The Salvation of Non-Catholics," *Downside Review,* Summer 1954, 256-263

O'Connor, W., "St. Thomas, the Church and the Mystical Body," *AER* 100 (1939) 290-300.

Ramsauer, M., "L'église presentée dans la perspective du salut," *Lumen Vitae* 10 (1955) 569-582.

Richard, L., "Une these fondamentale de l'oecumenisme: le baptême, incorporation visible a l'eglise," *NRT* 84 (1952) 485-492.

Shea, F., "The Principles of Extra Sacramental Justification in Relation to 'Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus,'" *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 1955, 125-151.

Strotmann, Th., "Les membres de l'église," *Irenikon* 25 (1952) 249-262.

Taymans, F., "L'encyclique Humani Generis et la théologie," *NRT* 73 (1951) 3-20.

Tromp, S., "Annotationes ad litteram encyclicam 'Mystici Corporis Christi,'" *Periodica* 32 (1943) 377-401.

Vodopivec, J., "Membri *in re* ed appartenenza *in voto* alla Chiesa di Christo," *Euntes Docete* 10 (1957) 65-103.

Weigel, G., "The Background of Humani Generis," *TS* 12 (1951) 208-230.

———, "Commentaries on Humani Generis," *TS* 12 (1951) 520-549.

III. PAPAL DOCUMENTS

Pius IX, "Nostis et Nobiscum," 5 December 1849, *Codicis Juris Canonici Fontes* 2, 837-849.

———, "Singulari quadam," 9 December 1854, *ibid.,* 891-897.

———, "Quanto conficiamur moerere," 10 August 1863, *ibid.*, 970-976.
Leo XIII, "Humanum genus," 20 April 1884, *ibid.*, 3, 221-234.
———, "Satis cognitum," 29 June 1896, *ibid.*, 3, 470-494.
Benedict XV, "Ad beatissimi," 1 November *AAS* 6 (1914) 565-581.
Pius XII, "Sermo ad alumnos seminariorum . . . ," *AAS* 31 (1939) 245-251.
———, "Mystici corporis Christi," 28 June 1943, *AAS* 35 (1943) 193-248.
———, "Humani generis," 12 August 1950, *AAS* 42 (1950) 562-578.
Holy Office, "Suprema haec sacra," 8 August, 1949, *AER* 127 (1952) 307-315.

PART I

THE DOCTRINE IN THE LATTER PART OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I

PRIOR TO THE VATICAN COUNCIL

1. THE THEOLOGIANS

Although the modern history of the doctrine of the necessity of the Church for salvation dates from the oft-quoted statements of Pope Pius IX in the Syllabus of Errors, the encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerere,* and the allocution *Singulari quadam,* we will leave these statements aside for a moment and scan briefly the explanations of this doctrine found among some of the theologians of the three decades preceding the Vatican Council. A brief glance at the writings of these theologians will serve two purposes; it will present to us the milieu in which the statements of Pius IX appeared; it will also enable us to ascertain the attitude of the theologians towards this doctrine in the years immediately preceding the Vatican Council.

Quite properly our examination begins with the writings of the famed Jesuit, John Perrone, who was professor of theology at the Roman College from the year 1824 and was still writing theological works in 1874. He was easily the most noted, as well as the most influential, theologian of his day. The publication of his course in theology gained for him a world-wide reputation. His *Praelectiones theologicae* appeared during the years 1835-42 and were published later in five volumes in 1845. They ran through thirty-five editions as *Praelectiones* and forty-two in compendium form. They were adopted as the text in a large number of seminaries.[1] In proposition eleven of his *De vera religione,* we read: "There can be no salvation for those culpably departing from this life in heresy, schism or infidelity, or outside the Catholic Church there is no salvation."[2] In explanation he writes:

---

[1] E. Hocedez, *Histoire de la théologie au XIXe siècle* (Brussels 1952) 2.353-355.

> . . . as is clear from the enunciation of the proposition itself, it is concerned only with those culpably living in heresy, schism or incredulity, or with those who are, as they say, formal sectaries, and not at all with those who are material [sectaries], or those who, from infancy, have been steeped in error and prejudice and who do not even suspect that they are living in heresy or schism, or if a doubt does arise in their minds, they search for the truth with their whole heart and with a sincere mind. We entrust these people to the judgment of God, to whom it belongs to look into and examine the motions and dispositions of the heart. For the goodness and mercy of God will not allow anyone who is not guilty of some wilful sin to be given over to eternal punishment. It would be against the expressed doctrine of the Church to affirm the contrary.[3]

Obviously for Perrone the whole consideration of the necessity of the Church pertains to those who possess knowledge of the truth of the Catholic claim; likewise the axiom, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus,* concerns only those culpably in heresy or schism. Concerning those inculpably in this state, he makes no statement. He is content to commit them to the goodness and mercy of God. This view of the doctrine received wide acceptance due both to the reputation of the author and the wide dissemination of his works.

---

[2] "Culpabiliter in haeresi vel schismate vel incredulitate ex hac vita decedentibus nulla salus esse potest seu extra ecclesiam catholicam nulla datur salus." J. Perrone, *Praelectiones theologicae* (Rome 1840) 1.354.

[3] ". . . ut patet ex ipsius propositionis enunciatione, de iis tantum agitur qui culpabiliter vel in haeresi vel schismate aut incredulitate versantur, seu de iis qui formalis, ut aiunt, sectarii sunt, minime vero de materialibus, ut fertur, seu de iis qui ab infantia erroribus ac praejudiciis imbuti sunt, quique nec dubitant quidam in haeresi se vel schismate versari, vel ex quod dubium in ipsorum mentibus exsurgit, toto corde ac sincere animo veritatem inquirunt; hos enim ad Dei judicium remittimus, cujus est cordium cogitationes habitusque introspicere atque scrutari, Dei enim bonitas et clementia non patitur quempiam aeternis cruciatibus addici, qui voluntariae culpae reus non sit. Contrarium affirmare esset contra expressam ecclesiae doctrinam." *Loc. cit.*

We should not be surprised to find frequent repetition of this view among the theologians who followed him.

Perrone dismissed this doctrine with a very brief treatment. In 1848 Raphael Cercia and Cardinal Gousset treated it with equal brevity. Cercia in fact has no separate treatment of this doctrine. He expresses the teaching in one sentence, saying that the axiom is to be understood of those, "who are outside both the body and the soul of the Church, and who pertain to that same body neither really nor in desire (*nec re nec voto*)."[4] He explains that the body of the Church comprises all the material visible elements while the soul includes faith, hope, charity, actual and sanctifying grace and the gifts of the Holy Ghost.[5] Gousset first makes it clear that: "One can belong to the body [of the Church] without belonging to the soul; just as one can belong to the soul without belonging to the body of the Church."[6] He then explains that it is possible to be saved if one belongs only to the soul of the Church. Such a person, he adds, does belong to the body in some way "by implicit desire."[7] Gousset agrees with Perrone in limiting the axiom, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus,* to those who are culpably outside the Church.[8]

By far the most comprehensive treatise *De ecclesia* to appear in the 19th century prior to the Vatican Council was that written by Father Patrick Murray, professor of theology at Maynooth. This work, in three volumes, appeared during the years 1860-63. It is a clear, methodic, erudite exposition of the Catholic theology on the Church. The seventh disputation is entitled *De unitate ecclesiae quoad individuos.* Section three of this disputation is given to a consideration *An extra ecclesiam detur salus aeterna.*[9]

---

[4] "Licet enim extra Ecclesiam nulla salus obtingat; hoc tamen de iis intelligitur qui sint extra tum corpus tum animam Ecclesiae, et nec re nec voto ad ejusdem corpus pertineant." R. Cercia, *Demonstratio catholica* (Paris 1878) 1.69.

[5] *Ibid.,* 62.

[6] "Or on peut appartenir au corps sans appartenir à l'âme, comme on peut appartenir à l'âme sans appartenir au corps de l'Église." C. Gousset, *Théologie dogmatique* (Paris 1848) 497.

[7] *Loc. cit.*

[8] *Ibid.,* 548.

[9] Patrick Murray, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Dublin 1860) 1.731.

In explaining the preliminary notions, Murray describes the sense of the question as follows: ". . . the question here is, whatever else may or may not be necessary for salvation, whether at least this is necessary, namely to be a member of the Church."[10] And again: "Whether a heretic or a schismatic can be saved?"[11] He then quotes Perrone at length to the effect that this question concerns only those "who are culpably living in heresy, schism or incredulity."[12] Murray clearly distinguishes between pertaining to the Church in reality and in desire and presents a detailed description of the nature and necessity of this desire.

> But the question is, whether it is of necessity of means to pertain to the Church in desire? This desire is twofold, explicit and implicit. The explicit would be present in the person who doubts whether his sect is the true Church and speaks to himself in these or similar words, "Since I reasonably doubt whether the Church to which I belong is the true Church, I will with all my heart and I am resolved to associate myself with the true church, whichever one it may be, as soon as it is sufficiently proposed to me." The explicit desire would be present also in the person to whom it has already been proved that his sect is false and the Catholic Church is true, and who has decided to reject his sect, leave it immediately and join the Catholic Church. The implicit desire would be present in the person who, being in no doubt concerning his own sect, would elicit an act of absolute conformity to the will of God in all things, or, which is the same thing, would decide sincerely to follow all the commandments of God. A desire of this type would be contained in an Act of contrition, in the resolution of not sinning again. In the light of these facts, it seems that the explicit desire is not necessary with the necessity of means. The implicit desire however is required with the necessity of means in those cases where there is required with the same necessity a resolution of observing all the more serious

---

[10] ". . . quaestio hic est, quaecumque alia ad salutem necessaria sint vel non sint, saltem ad hoc sit necessarium, sciz. Ecclesiae membrum esse." *Loc. cit.*

[11] "An haereticus vel schismaticus salvari possit?" *Loc. cit.*

[12] "Qui culpabiliter vel in haeresi vel schismate aut incredulitate versentur." *Ibid.*, 732.

> divine commands, and not in other cases, nor in another way: v.g. after the commission of a grave sin, for whose remission there is necessary with the necessity of means, contrition (imperfect in the sacrament, perfect outside it), in which there is included the resolution of not sinning again, and in which resolution the desire is said to be contained implicitly.[13]

This is a competent description of two ways of belonging to the Church: by implicit desire and explicit desire. It could be debated whether the first case Murray states above exemplifies explicit desire and not rather the implicit desire. More important however is the necessity which the author predicates of the implicit desire. It would seem from the above that Murray considers the necessity of pertaining to the Church in desire to apply only to those cases where a man is required to make an explicit act of keeping all commands of God; and intimates that this latter obligation is not a universal one. There could then be a case wherein the implicit desire would not be necessary, for example for a non-Catholic who avoided serious sin. There is just enough lack of clarity here to make it impossible to determine Murray's actual view.

At any rate Murray does not incorporate this *in re-in voto* distinction into his treatment of the doctrine which he expresses in a proposition identical in meaning with the explanation of Perrone. He states the Catholic doctrine thus: *Propositio III. Voluntarie extra ecclesiam decedentibus nulla datur salus.*[14] The proof of this proposition is taken from Scripture and the Fathers, with the stronger reliance being given to the patristic evidence.

---

[13] "Sed questio est, an sit de necessitate medii pertinere ad Ecclesiam *in voto?* Votum duplex est, explicitum et implicitum. Explicitum in eo esset qui, vel de sua secta dubitans an sit Ecclesia vera hisce aut aliis similibus verbis animo porponeret, 'Cum de Ecclesia ad quam pertineo, an vera sit, rationabiliter dubitem ex toto corde volo atque statuo me Ecclesiae verae, quaecumque ea sit, mihi sufficienter propositae me consociare': vel in eo, cui suam sectam esse falsam et Ecclesiam Catholicam veram jam exploratum est, quique apud se statueret suam sectam statim abijicere et deserere, et Ecclesiae Catholicae se conjugere. Votum implicitum in eo esset qui, de veritate suae sectae non dubitans, actum eliceret absolutae conformitatis voluntati divinae in omnibus, aut, quod idem esset, ex corde statueret omnia mandata Dei exequi. Huiusmodi votum continetur in actu contritionis, in propositio non peccandi de cetero. His positis, videtur votum explicitum non requiri de necessitate medii. Votum vero inplicitum iis in casibus necessitate requiritur propositum omnia mandata divina gravia servandi, et non aliis nec alio modo; v.g. post peccatum grave admissum, ad cujus remissionem necessaria est necessitate medii contritio (imperfecta in sacramento, perfecta extra), in qua includitur propositum non peccandi, in quo implicite dictum votum." *Ibid.*, 733-734.

Clement Schrader, S.J., in his *De unitate romana commentarius,* is content with merely stating the necessity of the Church without any detailed explanation. He states: ". . . considering its end, the ecclesiastical society founded and established by Christ is not a voluntary society but a necessary one, both with the necessity of means and the necessity of precept."[15]

In his *Apologie des Christentums* which appeared in the German in 1863, Franz Hettinger speaks of the necessity of the Church for salvation. In the chapter entitled "Christ the King," he describes how the Church is the implementation of the ministry of Christ. The Church possesses the truth and the Spirit of Christ and so there is no supernatural life apart from her. Christ then is the truth and all truth is in Him alone and in His Spirit; and the Church is the organ of His truth, of His Spirit, of His grace, of that supernatural life which he has poured out upon humanity by His Spirit, and no one can have part in His Spirit if he is not a member of His Body. There can be no salvation for one who is not a member of the Church. Thus salvation is effected in each person by his subordination to the real ecclesiastical society established by God, on the condition that he be a member of the body of the Church. In explaining how this membership is necessary for the individual, Hettinger shows that he regards this as the *ordinary way* of salvation:

> This [the body of the Church] is renewed and rejuvenated without ceasing by the addition of new members. The human race has come from God by Adam, from

---

[14] *Ibid.*, 735.

[15] ". . . suo spectato fine ecclesiastica societas a Christo aedificata ac condita societas est non voluntaria, sed necessaria tam necessitate praecepti quam necessitate medii." C. Schrader, S.J., *De unitate romana commentarius* (Friburg 1862) 11.

> whose blood all have sprung; the kingdom of regeneration has also come from God by Christ and His Church. Thus the Church is the ordinary way of salvation and outside of her, there is no salvation. Even though the grace of God calls someone by an extraordinary way, for example, Cornelius, or Paul, it directs him to the Church, so that he may receive from her the seal of the call by God.[16]

All those who wilfully refuse to become members are by that act excluded from the way of salvation: "Whoever then remains voluntarily outside the Church or who separates himself from her, thus separates himself from Christ and has no part with His Spirit; for 'those who are with God and Jesus Christ, are one with the bishop' (Ignat. M. *ad Philadelph.*, c. 3)."[17] Hettinger then makes it clear that the Church does not condemn all those who are outside her and consistently has refused to judge individuals. He explains that good people may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church: "Although separated from the body of the visible Church, they belong to the soul of the Church in the same fashion as infants baptized in separate confessions."[18] The author describes the soul of the Church as the habitation of the Holy Spirit, His gifts, faith, hope and charity and sanctifying grace; the body of the Church consists in the exterior bond of faith and fellowship.

Thus for Hettinger the necessity of Church is a formal and objective truth; but the Church constitutes only the ordinary way of salvation, other ways being available to the grace of God. Anyone who voluntarily refuses to use this ordinary way can have no share in the Spirit of Christ; however those who through no fault of their own are separated from this ordinary way of salvation can gain salvation through the soul of the Church which is sanctifying grace, the theological virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. In much the same vein, Henry Perreyve in 1864 in the second volume of his *Entretiens sur l'église catholique,* explains the doctrine by utilizing "the theological distinction between the soul and the body of the Church. Only the body of the Church possesses the ordinary means of salvation; but these means do not exhaust the grace of God, who wills the salvation of all men, and all the just belong to the soul of the Church."[19] It is his claim that theology teaches this as "a certain doctrine" that "all and only the just pertain to the soul of the Church."[20] So the soul of the Church may be termed the "society of the just."[21] The body is defined as "the body of the faithful exteriorly united by the ties of obedience to the same pastors and by participation in the same sacraments."[22] Therefore what he terms the body of the Church is only the "depositary of the ordinary means of justification."[23] He considers this body as the source of sanctity on the earth but "its privilege in this regard is not so exclusive that outside of her visible constitution, many men cannot still, although with more difficulty, arrive at justification."[24] As a consequence it is impossible for us to trace the frontiers of the Church clearly.[25]

---

[16] ". . . dieser aber erbaut sich immer aufs neue und verjüngt sich durch die vom gemeinsamen Leibe aufgenommenen Glieder. Wie das Menschengeschlect ausgegangen ist von Gott durch den einen Adam, aus dessen Blut alle stammen, so geht das Rech der Wiedergeburt aus von Gott durch Christus und seine Kirche. So ist die Kirche der ordentliche Weg des Heils und auser ihr darum kein Heil. Selbst da, wo die Gnade des Herrn einen unmittelbar und auf auserordentlichem Wege beruft, wie einen Cornelius und Paulus, sendet sie ihn hin zur Kirche, um von ihr des Siegel seines Berufes aus Gott zu empfangen." *Apologie des Christentums* (7 ed. Freiburg i. Br. 1897) 4.91-92.

[17] "Wer darum freiwillig auser der Kirche steht oder von der Kirche sich scheidet, der scheidet sich von Christus, hat keinen Antheil an seinem Geiste; denn 'die mit Gott sind und Jesu Christo, diese sind eins mit dem Bischoft' (Ignat, M. *ad Philadelph.*, c. 3)." *Ibid.*, 92.

[18] "Wenn auch vom sichtbaren Leibe der Kirche getrennt, gehören sie, wie die getauften Kinder fremder Confessionen, der Seele der Kirch an." *Ibid.*, 94.

---

[19] ". . . distinction théologique de l'âme et du corps de l'Église. Le corps de l'Église possede seul les moyens ordinaires du salut; mais ces moyens n'epuissent pas la grâce de Dieu qui veut le salut de tous les hommes, et tous les justes appartiennent à l'âme de l'Église." H. Perreyve, *Entretiens sur l'église catholique* (Paris 1864) 2.478.

[20] ". . . une doctrine certaine. . . ." "Omnes ac soli justi pertinent ad Ecclesiae animam." *Loc. cit.*

[21] ". . . société des justes. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

[22] ". . . la société de fideles extérieurement unis par les liens de l'obéissance aux mêmes pasteurs et la participation aux mêmes sacrements." *Ibid.,* 479.

[23] ". . . depositaire des moyens ordinaires de la justification." *Loc. cit.*

[24] ". . . mais enfin son privilège n'est pas, à cet égard, tellement exclusif, qu'en dehors de sa constitution visible beaucoup d'hommes ne puissent encore, quoique plus dificilement, arriver à la justification." *Loc. cit.*

[25] *Ibid.,* 480.

In explaining the meaning of the axiom *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* he claims it is equivalent to "outside the soul of the Church, no salvation; or in other words, the just alone will be saved."[26] Further even if this axiom were to be applied to the body of the Church it would effect only those culpably outside. To support this he quotes from the passage from Perrone which we have already seen. He sums up his view of the doctrine in these words: "This is the teaching of all the theologians without exception. When we say, "Outside the Church no salvation," it is well understood that we mean: the personal and voluntary crime of having refused the true religion knowingly, and of having resisted the authority of the Church, demonstrated to be the true Church, excludes one from salvation."[27]

F. R. Reinerding, professor of dogmatic theology at the seminary of Fulda, published his *Theologia fundamentalis* in 1864. He states that the necessity of the Church is only a necessity of precept: "Our thesis reflects only necessity of precept and therefore we are speaking only of those who are excluded from the body of the Church through their own fault."[28] We can understand this by seeing the Church clearly for what it is, the ordinary way of attaining eternal salvation: "The actual life by which the members of the Church are vivified by the Divine element in the Church, is communicated to them, according to the ordinary law of providence through the ministry of the Church and [this life] cannot be communicated to those who are outside the Church through their own fault."[29] The author makes it clear that his intention has been to present the Church as the ordinary way of salvation: "We preserve the necessity of the ministry of the Church in order to communicate supernatural life, according to the ordinary law of providence; however we admit that this life can be received without such a ministry in an extraordinary way."[30]

---

[26] ". . . hors de l'âme de l'Église point de salut: autrement dit, les justes seuls seront sauvés." *Ibid.,* 508.

[27] "C'est l'enseignment de tous les théologiens, sans exception. Quand donc nous disons, *Hors de l'Église point de salut,* il est bien entendu que nous voulons dire: le crime personnel et voluntairement commis d'avoir repoussé la vérité religieuse connue, et d'avoir resisté à l'authorité de l'Église demontrée la véritable Église, exclut du salut éternel." *Ibid.,* 512.

[28] "Thesis nostra in sola necessitate praecepti versatur, et ideo de eis solis loquimur, qui *culpa sua* ab Ecclesiae corpore excluduntur." F. H. Reinerding, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Monasterii Guestphalorum 1864) 148.

[29] "Actualis vita, qua membra corporis Ecclesiae a Divino Ecclesiae elemento vivificantur, ex ordinaria providentiae lege per ministerium Ecclesiae communicatur et illis, qui sua culpa extra Ecclesiam sunt, communicari nequit." *Ibid.,* 158.

Thus Reinerding's agreement with Hettinger is apparent in viewing the visible society, the Roman Catholic Church, as the ordinary way of attaining salvation, allowing for the existence of extraordinary ways of attaining the same end.

In 1865 Mgr. Besson, Bishop of Nimes delivered a sermon at Besançon on the subject *Hors de l'église point de salut*. This sermon was later included in a book entitled, *Oeuvre de l'Homme-Dieu*. It appeared as conference number three entitled, *Où va l'église?* The bishop states that the axiom can be understood only through understanding the distinction between the body and the soul of the Church. He continues: "It is possible to belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body, and it is possible to belong to the body of the Church without belonging to the soul."[31] He defines the soul of the Church as "the assembly of the just who possess faith, hope and the charity of Jesus Christ."[32] He states that "corporally heretics, schismatics and infidels are outside the Church; spiritually they can be within it."[33] It is but a short step from this to his next contention, namely that "whoever is in good faith is in the Church; but outside the Church there is no salvation."[34] This logically brings him to a further statement concerning the existence of an invisible Church which he does not further define: "He who is found just and holy, be he in the invisible Church, is reunited eternally to the Head; he who is found unjust and impure, be he in the visible Church, is eternally separated from the Head."[35] As is clear, this is said in relation to the moment of judgment. So Mgr. Besson actually appeals to three principles to explain this doctrine: the distinction between the body and soul of the Church; the efficacy of good faith; and the existence of an invisible Church. He tells us that he has been guided in his exposition by the treatment of Father Perrone; in reality he has developed that treatment considerably.

---

[30] "Necessitas ministerii Ecclesiae ad supernaturalem vitam communicandam ex *ordinaria* providentiae lege vindicatur, quo extraordinaria via sine tali ministerio vitam hanc recipi posse admittimus." *Ibid.*, 153.

[31] "On peut faire partie de l'âme de l'Église sans faire partie de son corps, et on peut faire partie de son corps sans faire partie de son âme." Mgr. Besson, *L'Église—Oeuvre de l'Homme-Dieu* (17 ed. Paris 1918) 53-54.

[32] "Considerée dans son âme, on peut la definir: L'assemblée des justes qui possèdent la foi, l'espérance et la charité de Jesus-Christ." *Ibid.*, 7.

[33] ". . . corporéllement les hérétiques, les schismatiques, les infidèles, son en dehors de l'Église; spirituellement ils peuvent être au dedans." *Ibid.*, 54.

[34] "Qui est dans la bonne foi est dans l'Église; mais hors de l'Eglise point de salut." *Ibid.*, 63.

Father Francis X. Schouppe, S.J., professor of theology at Jesuit College in Louvain, authored a very popular manual of dogmatic theology. By 1867 it had run through twenty-two editions. His proposition of the doctrine reads: "Christ instituted His Church as a necessary society, so that outside of it there is no salvation."[36] In explaining the meaning of the proposition, Schouppe posits in effect only necessity of precept: "It is said that the Church is necessary for salvation, that is, all are bound by a divine command to enter it and become members of its body."[37] The source of this obligation rests upon the divine precept of Christ. Speaking of the axiom he writes: "Outside the Church, no salvation: that is for those living culpably outside her, and thus pertaining neither to the body nor the soul of the Church, there remains no way of salvation."[38] Present here are the two notions we have found almost consistently in the authors examined thus far: the axiom pertains only to those culpably outside the Church; it signifies merely that a man must belong either to the body or to the soul of the Church in order to attain salvation.

Gutti is of the same mind: "Those who are knowingly and willingly outside the True Church of Christ, cannot attain eternal salvation."[39] An anonymous *De ecclesia Christi* appeared in 1867 at the seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris. It states that those culpably outside the Church cannot attain salvation and those inculpably outside are deprived of the special aids that can be found only in the Church of Christ.[40]

---

[35] "Qui est trouvé juste et saint, fut-il dans l'Église invisible, est reuni éternellement au chef; qui est trouvé injuste et impur, fut-il dans l'Église visible, est éternellement saparé du chef." *Loc. cit.*

[36] "Christus Ecclesiam suam instituit ut societatem necessariam, ita ut extra illum nulla sit salus." F. C. Schouppe, S.J., *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae* (Paris 1867) 176.

[37] "Dicitur Ecclesiam esse necessariam, hoc est, omnes eam ingredi, et membra corporis ejus fieri, divino mandato teneri." *Loc. cit.*

[38] "Extra illam nulla salus: hoc est, extra illam culpabiliter versantibus, ac proinde nec ad animam nec ad corpus Ecclesiae pertinentibus, nulla salutis via remanet." *Loc. cit.*

The consideration of the explanation of Father A. Bonal concludes our survey of the theologians of this period. His *Institutiones theologicae* had run through ten editions by 1869 and eighteen editions by 1893. He states the doctrine thus: "Therefore outside the Roman Church, no salvation is to be attained."[41] He immediately makes the distinction between the soul and the body of the Church and then explains the doctrine in two statements: "Outside the soul of the Roman Church, no salvation is to be attained." . . . "No salvation is to be attained by those voluntarily leaving the body of the Roman Church."[42] For there is a grave precept to enter the body of the Church and willingly to disregard it is knowingly to violate a grave precept and thus render salvation impossible.[43]

The examination of the explanations advanced by these authors enables us to determine the theological milieu in which the statements of Pius IX appeared. John Perrone led the way in insisting that the doctrine of the necessity of the Church, especially the axiom "Outside the Church there is no salvation," was concerned only with those culpably living outside the Church. Later writers rested heavily upon the authority of Perrone and his view was predominate in the explanations of Gousset, Murray, Hettinger, Perreyve, Schouppe, Gutti and Bonal. Although not employed by Perrone, the body-soul distinction was widely used in explaining this doctrine. It is found in the explanations of Cercia, Gousset, Hettinger, Perreyve, Besson, Schouppe, Bonal and Gutti. Bonal, Reinerding, and Schouppe state that only necessity of precept is involved here. That the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation is claimed by Hettinger, Perreyve and Reinerding. The *in re-in voto* distinction was used by Cercia in conjunction with the body-soul explanation. Gousset also alluded to the *in re-in voto* distinction although his principal explanation was the body-soul approach. Patrick Murray elaborated a fine explanation of the *in re-in voto* solution but unfortunately left it aside and advanced the explanation of Perrone. Several authors were extremely brief on this important doctrine, notably Schrader, Cercia and Gousset. Finally the concept of an invisible Church was advanced by Mgr. Besson.

---

[39] "Qui scientes et volentes sunt extra veram Christi Ecclesiam, salutem aeternam non consequuntur." V. Gutti, O.P., *Institutions apologetico-polemicae* (Rome 1867) 7.427.

[40] *De ecclesia Christi* (Paris 1867) 164.

[41] "Ergo extra Romanam Ecclesiam, nulla obtinendus est salus." A. Bonal, *Institutiones theologicae* (10 ed. Tolouse 1869) 435.

[42] "Extra animam Romanae Ecclesiae, nulla salus obtinenda est." . . . "Extra corpus Romanae Ecclesia voluntarie decedentibus, nulla obtinenda est salus." *Ibid.*, 436.

[43] *Loc. cit.*

With the exception of Clement Schrader who merely stated that the Church was necessary with the necessity of means and of precept, every author we have examined relied on either the distinction between the body and soul of the Church, the concept of the Church as the ordinary way of salvation, or the statement that the doctrine applies only to those culpably outside the Church. Many of them combined two or more of these explanations. These were the explanations being advanced at the time of the statements of Pius IX which we shall presently examine. That these explanations have serious shortcomings is, we think, obvious in the light of the approach of the magisterium outlined in the introduction. Neither the body-soul explanation nor the designation of the Church as the ordinary way of salvation sufficiently safeguards the Church's claim to be the exclusive general means of salvation. The application of the whole doctrine solely to those culpably outside the Church is even less satisfactory. Knowledge of these deficiencies will help us to understand Pope Pius IX's many references to this doctrine and his frequent exhortations to the Bishops and the clergy to present clearly and accurately the Catholic teaching on the necessity of the Church.

2. THE STATEMENTS OF POPE PIUS IX

The most momentous struggle of the courageous Pope Pius IX was not his unsuccessful effort to preserve his temporal power, but rather his struggle against the mentality which has been styled "liberal Catholicism." This term requires careful definition. Liberalism in general signifies the vindication of personal rights and natural aspirations of individuals against the claims of centralized power and the rigors of positive doctrine. To apply this concept rigorously to liberal Catholicism is an absurdity. Perhaps the best description of liberal Catholicism is that given by C. Constantin in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*. He writes:

> Catholic liberalism never intended to be, and never has been dogmatic liberalism which has as its basic principle the absolute sovereignty of individual judgment. Catholic liberalism is solely political and social. It is, inasmuch as it can be defined, the tendency that pursues, the movement that seeks and the theory that, since 1830, sees the exterior progress of the Church, the maintenance or reestablishment and development of its influence on societies and consequently upon souls, in the effective acceptance, in the measure which orthodoxy permits, of the principles with which the French Revolution has permeated society and souls, and which are known under the name of *modern freedoms*.[44]

It is then this general mentality which is described by the term liberal Catholicism. It is according to this understanding that Montalembert, Dupanloup, Falloux and Lacordaire were rightly styled liberals.[45] This movement insisted it was concerned only with the political and social spheres; but as we shall see, it could cause serious repercussions in the field of doctrine.

---

[44] "Le libéralisme catholique n'a jamais voulu être, et n'a jamais été le libéralisme dogmatique qui a pour principe fondamental le souveraineté absolue de la raison indivuelle. Il est uniquement politique et social. Il est, autant du moins qu'on le puisse enfermer dans une définition, la tendance qui poursuit, la tactique qui cherche et la théorie qui voit, depuis 1830, le progrès extérieur de l'Église, le maintien, ou le rétablissement et le développement de son action sur les sociétés et partant sur les âmes, dans une acceptation actuelle, aussi complète que le permet l'orthodoxie, des principes connus sous le nom de *libertés* modernes, et dont la Révolution française a pénétré les sociétés et les âmes." C. Constantin, "Libéralisme catholique," *DTC* IX 1 (1926) 506-507. See also L. Billot, *De ecclesia Christi,* I, 55-63.

[45] See Fernand Hayward, *Pie IX et son temps* (Paris 1948) 152.

This mentality of liberal Catholicism seems to have influenced the explanations of the doctrine of the Church's necessity which have just been examined. This does not mean that all the authors mentioned are to be classified as liberal Catholics. However, it has been clearly shown that their explanations do not emphasize the Church's claim to be the absolutely exclusive and necessary general means of salvation. This position harmonizes so well with the position of liberal Catholics in the political and social order, that it seems necessary to conclude that the spirit of liberal Catholicism has strongly influenced the theologians' treatment of the Church's necessity for salvation. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Pope Pius IX—as we shall presently see—went a step further and explicitly connected the liberal Catholics' program with the denial of the Church's necessity for salvation.

To see how this came about we must return to the beginning of the pontificate of Pope Pius IX. When he was elected to succeed the austere Gregory XVI, he was hailed by both those inside and outside the Church as the "liberal Pope." And indeed he seemed to be just that. He began at once a program of reform in the Papal States which was to continue until he was forced to flee into exile by the murder of his premier, Count Rossi, and the coming of the "Republic of Rome" in 1848.

On April 12, 1850, Pope Pius IX returned from his exile in Gaeta. He returned to Rome a wiser and a sadder Pope. Though he would continue to effect reforms which he thought necessary, his bitter experience with a liberal program made him an avowed enemy of the revolution and the spirit of liberalism. His basic approach to the spirit of the times was from that moment on one of strong opposition. In the face of that spirit he was most ardent in vindicating the unique position held by the Church as *the* Kingdom of God on earth. Two of his most extensive defenses of this teaching are found in the allocution *Singulari quadam* and in the encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerere.*

The *Singulari quadam* is an allocution which was delivered on the ninth of December in 1854 to the bishops and cardinals gathered in Rome for the dedication of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It was delivered in what may be called the atmosphere of liberalism. Characteristic of that liberalism had been the assertion that the state was completely independent of the religious power and as a conclusion from that, the belief that the state had an obligation of complete indifference and neutrality in matters of religion.[46] The position of the liberal Catholics had been considerably moderated from this view since the time of Lammenais; by 1847 they admitted the feasibility of union of the two powers in the ideal state but as a practical measure they advocated the neutrality of the state in religious matters,[47] not from a spirit of religious indifference, but out of a sincere desire to obtain for the Church complete freedom of action. They considered full liberty of action the only guarantee of that freedom.[48]

In October of 1852, Montalembert had claimed that moderate liberty would be the salvation of the Church;[49] and that he was unwilling to admit that the Catholic Church cried out for liberty only where she was weak, and, where she was strong, denied that liberty to others.[50] Statements of a similar kind were finding much support and it was in this atmosphere that the allocution *Singulari quadam* was given. Many of the liberal statements (especially those of Montalembert) were made with many reservations and very often submitted to the judgment of the Holy See. Nevertheless, though Pius IX was grateful to these men for the good they had done the Church, he felt their program was but a short step from religious indifferentism. He revealed his misgivings years later in 1863 to Werner de Merode. The Holy Father was preparing a letter of disapproval for Montalembert[51] and de Merode was defending the Count. In a letter to Montalembert, de Merode reveals the following:

> I did my best to defend you. I maintained that you in-

---

[46] "De la souveraineté absolue de la nation résulte l'absolute indépendence du pouvoir civil à l'égard du pouvoir religieux, et même de toute autorité religieuse; et, comme corollarie, l'indifférence et la neutralité de l'État en matière de religion." Hocedez, *op. cit.,* 2.160.

[47] *Ibid.,* 170.

[48] *Ibid.,* 2.163.

[49] See Ed Lecanuet, *Montalembert* (Paris 1902) 3.72.

[50] *DTC,* "Libéralisme catholique. Luttes d'idées sous Pie IX." IX-1 580.

[51] For his speeches made at the Congress of Malines in 1863, see Lecanuet, *op. cit.,* 3.348 ff.

> tended to speak only of civil liberty, of political tolerance, and in no sense of dogmatic and theological indifference; that you wished only to remove the Church from the tutelage of schismatic, rationalistic governments. He replied, "Oh! There is nothing to be said of that; but, my dead friend, it is a sin not to believe that outside of the Church there is no salvation. . . ." You see around what a misunderstanding the conversation always turns, dogmatic indifference confused with civil tolerance. . . .[52]

Evidently Pius IX saw the program of liberal Catholics as a weakening of the Catholic truth that there is no salvation outside the Church; he would not allow this weakening to go unchallenged, even if it meant bringing sorrow to men who had served the Church well in many respects.[53] He would not be opposed to what was legitimate in the new order; but he would violently oppose any insinuation that liberty and progress were an alternate means of salvation to the means offered by the Church. This was the Pontiff's frame of mind in 1863; in all probability the same view influenced his thinking earlier in 1854 when he took the occasion of the definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception to charge the bishops to defend fearlessly the doctrine of the necessity of the Church for salvation.

This was the prime purpose of the allocution *Singulari quadam* delivered in secret consistory to the cardinals, archbishops and bishops who had assembled in Rome. The Holy Father speaks first of the error of rationalism and then takes up the question of the necessity of the Church: "Not without sorrow have we known that another error, not less deadly, has taken possession of certain parts of the Catholic world, and has entered the minds of very many Catholics who think that they can well hope for the eternal salvation of all those who have in no way lived in the true Church of Christ."[54] Pius IX plainly considered it a ruinous error to think that a man could be saved without having some affiliation with the Church of Christ. The terminology employed (*nequaquam versantur*) does not tell us exactly what degree of affiliation is required. Certainly we can say it would be stretching these words greatly to interpret them as referring to membership in the Church. Of further interest here is the fact that the Holy Father ascribes this error to Catholics, not to those outside the Church. He continues:

---

[52] "J'ai cherché a vous defendre de mon mieux. J'ai soutenu que vous n'entendiez parler que de la liberté civile, de la tolérance politique, et nullement d'indifférence dogmatique, théologique; que vous ne voulez que soustraire l'Église à la tutelle des gouvernements schismatiques, rationalistes, etc. Il a repondu: 'Oh! à celà il n'y a rien à dire; mais, mon cher âmi, c'est un pêche que de ne pas croire que hors de l'Église point du salut. . . .' Vous voyez sur quelle equivoque roulent toujours les converations, indifférence dogmatique confondue avec tolérance civile. . . ." *Ibid.*, 365.

[53] On the question of Catholic liberalism, see: Hocedez, *op. cit.*, 2 ch. 4; *DTC*, IX 577 ff.; Hayward, *op. cit.*, ch. 20; Roger Aubert, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (Paris 1952) ch. 8.

> For that reason they are accustomed to inquire frequently what is going to be the fate and the condition of those who have never given themselves to the Catholic faith, and led on by most useless reasons, they expect an answer which will favor this depraved opinion. Far be it from Us, Venerable Brethren, to presume to establish limits to the divine mercy, which is infinite. Far be it from us to wish to scrutinize the hidden counsels and judgments of God, which are "a great deep," and which human thought can never penetrate.[55]

The phrase "depraved opinion" shows how forcefully the Pontiff rejected this view. The last two sentences were written to answer the severe criticism and accusations which were being hurled against the Church. He protests that the Catholic teaching on the necessity of the Church in no way attempts to put a limit on the mercy of God. Nevertheless all the criticism and accusation of the enemies of the Church did not cause the courageous Pope from charging the bishops to teach clearly and without fear the doctrine of the Church's necessity:

---

[54] "Errorem alterum nec minus exitiosum aliquas catholici orbis partes occupasse non sine moerere novimus, animisque insedisse plerumque catholicorum, qui bene sperandum de aeterna illorum omnium salute putant, qui in vera Christi Ecclesia nequaquam versantur." Pius IX, *Singulari quadam, Codicis juris canonici fontes,* 2.894.

[55] "Idcirco percontari saepenumero solent, quanam furtura post obitum sit eorum sors, et conditio, qui catholicae fidei minime addicit sunt, vanissimisque adductis rationibus responsum praestolantur, quod pravae huic sententiae suffragetur. Absit, Venerabiles Fratres, ut misericordiae divinae, quae infinita est, terminos audeamus apponere; absit ut perscrutari velimus arcana consilia et judicia Dei, quae sunt abyssus multa, nec humana queunt cogitatione penetrari." *Loc. cit.*

> In accordance with our apostolic duty, we desire to stir up your episcopal solicitude and vigilance to drive out of the minds of men, to the extent to which you are able to use all your energies, that equally impious and deadly opinion that the way of eternal salvation can be found in any religion. With all the skill and learning at your command, you should prove to the people committed to your care that this dogma of the Catholic faith is in no way opposed to the divine mercy and justice. Certainly we must hold it as of faith that no one can be saved outside of the apostolic Roman Church, that this is the only Ark of Salvation, that the one who does not enter this is going to perish in the deluge.[56]

This is how the Catholic bishops were to explain this axiom to their flocks. They were to show it was in no conflict with the divine mercy; but they were not to detract one iota from the clear statement made by the Holy Father: one who did not enter the ark of salvation would perish and that ark was the Roman Catholic Church. This was to be imposed on the faithful as an obligation "ex fide"; they were not free to dispute this truth.

There is one further statement which the bishops were to include in their teaching of this dogma:

> But nevertheless we must likewise hold it as certain that those who labor in ignorance of the true religion, if that be invincible, will never be charged with any

---

[56] "Quod vero Apostolici Nostri muneris est, Epicopalem vestram et sollicitudinem et vigilantiam excitatam volumus, ut equantum potestis contendere, opinionem illam impiam aeque ac funestam ab hominum mente propulsetis, nimirum quavis in religione reperiri posse aeternae salutis viam. Ea qua praestatis solertia ac doctina demonstretis commissis curae vestrae populis miserationi ac iustitiae divina dogmata catholicae fidei neutiquam adversari. Tenendum quippe ex fide est extra Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam salvum fieri neminem posse, hanc esse unicam salutis arcam, hanc qui non fuerit ingressus, diluvio periturum." *Loc. cit.*

> guilt on this account before the eyes of the Lord. Now who is there who would arrogate to himself the power to point out the extent of such ignorance according to the nature and the variety of peoples, regions, talents and so many other things? For really when, loosed from these bodily bonds, we see God as He is, we shall certainly understand with what intimate and beautiful a bond the divine mercy and justice are joined together. But while we live on earth, weighed down by this mortal body that darkens the mind, let us hold most firmly out of Catholic doctrine that there is one God, one faith, one baptism. It is wicked to go on enquiring beyond this.[57]

No one would be punished merely because he was in invincible ignorance. This was not Catholic doctrine and never had been. No one will ever be punished for his ignorance, if that ignorance be invincible. Such a clear statement was an effective answer to the calumnies being hurled at the Church. Unfortunately this has been perhaps the most misquoted and misunderstood statement of all the words of Pius IX. Truly, he stated that no one will be condemned because of ignorance that is invincible; but he did not say that they would be saved by means of that ignorance. The Pope's statement is merely a negative one. Invincible ignorance of the Catholic Church will not of itself send anyone to hell. It would be distorting the Holy Father's words to take this as an exception to the Church's universal necessity.[58] It would be an equal distortion of the Holy Father's meaning to maintain that his words indicate that this whole question of the necessity of the Church concerns only those who are in vincible ignorance or who are culpably outside the Church. Invincible ignorance merely excuses one of culpability in not being a member of the Church. It has no positive salvific value and it is erroneous to quote the Holy Father in such a way as to weaken his clear statement that outside the Catholic Church no one is saved. Invincible ignorance has nothing at all to do with the necessity of the Church for salvation. One in invincible ignorance still must come into salvific contact with the Catholic Church, otherwise he will not be saved.[59] We should not elevate invincible ignorance of the Catholic Church to an extraordinary way of salvation. So there are two important statements stressed in this allocution. First the Catholic Church is the only way of salvation; unless one is within the Church he cannot be saved.[60] Secondly, one who is in invincible ignorance of the Church will not be punished by God because of that ignorance. These two statements are in no way contradictory; however the Holy Father spends no time in explaining how they complement one another. He is intent on having the bishops preach the truth that the Church is necessary for salvation and to silence the critics of the Church by teaching also that no one will be condemned unjustly. The rest of the explanation he leaves to their own skill and learning.

---

[57] "Sed tamen pro certo pariter habendum est, qui verae religionis ignorantia laborent si ea sit invincibilis, nulla ipsos obstringi huiusce rei culpa ante oculos Domini. Nunc vero quis tantum sibi arroget, ut huiusmodi ignorantiae designare limites queat iuxta populorum, regionum, ingeniorum, aliarumque rerum tam mularum rationem et varietatem? Enimvero cum soluti corporeis hisce vinculis videbimus Deum sicuti est, intelligemus profecto quam arcto pulcroque nexu miseratio ac iustitia divina copulentur; quamdiu vero in terris versamur mortali hac gravati mole que habetat animam firmissime teneamus et catholica doctrina unum Deum esse, unam fidem, unum baptismus; ulterius inquirendo progredi nefas est." *Loc. cit.*

[58] See below, 36-37 and 103 for two examples of such an interpretation.

Pius IX expanded his explanation of this doctrine in 1863 in an encyclical to the archbishops and bishops of Italy. The country was beset by hordes of revolutionaries; some so cunning that they were subtly trying to lead the Italians away from the Catholic faith. Behind it all was the struggle to destroy the temporal power of the Pope and effect a united Italy. There was a secret society called the Carbonari which had an ideology partly derived from the French Freemasons, who were dedicated to the destruction of the Catholic faith. But they realized that they could proceed only with extreme caution:

---

[59] "The fact of the matter is, of course, that the possibility and existence of a genuine invincible ignorance about the true Church of God has nothing whatsoever to do with the Church's real necessity of means for eternal salvation. . . . Hence, those who have hitherto remained in ignorance of the true Church through no fault of their own still need this society in order to attain to the Beatific Vision." J. C. Fenton, "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER,* 118 (1948) 225.

[60] The pope does not specify what being "within" the Church means in this regard.

> They [Carbonari] were to wage their war upon the Church subtly, indirectly. They were to persuade the priests that in subscribing to these principles and beliefs they were being truly Christian; they were to attempt no direct attack upon Catholicism, which was hopeless, but to corrupt her from within by subverting her beliefs; if possible, some day, they were to delude a Pope himself into furthering their aims without realizing that he was betraying the Catholic tradition.[61]

Part of this subtle attack was to persuade the Italians that the Church was not the exclusive way of salvation. It was against this spirit that Pius IX had spoken earlier in an encyclical to the Italian Hierarchy in 1849, warning them of men who were teaching that Protestantism was only another version of the true religion.[62] He returned to this theme again in 1863 in the encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerere.*

After lamenting the great calamities that had befallen the Church, the Pope renewed all the condemnations and declarations of his earlier statements. Then he turned his attention to the teaching on the necessity of the Church:

> And here, Our Beloved Sons and Venerable Brethren, we must again mention and reprove a most serious error in which some Catholics have unhappily fallen, thinking that men living in errors and altogether apart (*alienos*) from the true faith and Catholic unity can attain to eternal life. This indeed is completely opposed to Catholic doctrine. It is known to Us and to You that those who labor in invincible ignorance concerning our most holy religion, and who, assiduously observing the natural law

---

[61] E. E. Y. Hales, *Pio Nono: A Study of European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century* (N. Y. 1954) 23-24.

[62] "Idcirco consilium inierunt de Italis populis traducendis ad protestantium placita et conventicul; in quibus ut illos decipiant, non aliud esse dictitant. quam diversam verae eiusdem christianae religionis formam, in qua, aeque ac in Ecclesia catholica, Deo placere datum sit." Pius IX, *Nostis et nobiscum, Codicis juris canonici fontes,* 2.839.

> and its precepts which God has inscribed in the hearts of all, and being ready to obey God, live an honest and upright life can, through the working of the divine light and grace, attain eternal life, since God, who clearly sees, inspects, and knows the mind, the intentions, the thoughts and habits of all, will, by reason of His supreme goodness and kindness, never allow anyone who has not the guilt of wilful sin to be punished by eternal sufferings. But it is also a perfectly well-known Catholic dogma, that no one can be saved outside of the Catholic Church, and that those who are contumacious against the authority and the definitions of that same Church, and who are pertinaciously divided from the unity of that Church and from Peter's successor, the Roman Pontiff, to whom the custody of the vineyard has been committed by the Savior, cannot obtain eternal salvation.[63]

This passage contains four distinct statements which are in no way contradictory, but which must be understood in their proper meaning if one is not to distort the teaching of the Holy Father.

FIRST STATEMENT: It is "opposed to Catholic doctrine" to believe that those who are "completely separated (*alienos*) from the "true faith and Catholic unity" can attain eternal life. The term *alienos* has not of itself any relation to "membership" in the Church; its importance lies in the fact that it indicates a complete separation from the Church. Thus only those are excluded from eternal life who are without any attachment to the Church whatsoever. It is *complete* separation from the Church which makes salvation impossible. On the basis of this statement we may infer that there is some sort of incomplete attachment to the Church which will enable a man to be saved. Fortunately we are not left to our own inference for the Holy Father complements this concept with the statement which follows. He tells us exactly what this incomplete attachment to the Church is.

---

[63] Atque hic, Dilecti Filii Nostri et Venerabiles Fratres, iterum commemorare et reprehendere oportet gravissimum errorm, in quo nonnulli catholici misere versantur, qui homines in erroribus viventes, et a vera fide, atque a catholica unitate alienos, ad aeternam vitam pervenire posse opinantur. Quod quidem catholicae doctrinae vel maxime adversatur. Notum Nobis, Vobisque est, eos qui invincibili circa sanctissimam nostram religionem ignorantia laborant, quique naturalem legem, eiusque praecepta in omnium cordibus a Deo insculpta sedulo servantes, ac Deo obedire parati, honestam rectamque vitam agunt, posse, divinae lucis, et gratiae operante virtue, aeternam consequi vitam, cum Deus, qui omnium mentes, animos, cogitationes, habitusque plane intuetur, scrutatur et noscit, pro summa sua bonitate, et clementia minime patiatur quempiam aeternis punire suppliciis qui voluntariae culpae reatum non habeat. Sed notissimum quoque est catholicum dogma, neminem scilicet extra catholicam Ecclesiam posse salvari, et contumaces adversus eiusdem Ecclesiae auctoritatem, definitiones, et ab ipsius Ecclesiae unitate, atque a Petri Successore Romano Pontifice, cui *vineae custodia a Salvatore est commissas,* pertinaciter divisos, aeternam non posse obtinere salutem." Pius IX, *Quanto conficiamur moerere, Codicis juris canonici fontes,* 2.972.

SECOND STATEMENT: Those who are "in invincible ignorance of our most holy religion, and who, assiduously observing the natural law and its precepts . . . and being ready to obey God, live an honest and upright life, can, through the working of the divine light and grace, attain eternal life. . . ." This is the completion of the merely negative statement concerning invincible ignorance which we saw in the *Singulari quadam*. It is also the explanation of how a person can be attached to the Church without being a member. For it is obvious that the people mentioned here are not members of the Catholic Church and yet they can be saved. Since they can be saved they must not be completely separated from the "Catholic faith and unity." Otherwise the Pope would here be contradicting what he said in the previous statement. To avoid this contradiction and harmonize the two statements, we must affirm that there is possible a salvific contact[64] with the Church which is something less than membership in it. This is the fashion in which we should understand the Pope's words here; we should not see them as any weakening of the axiom, "Outside the Church there is no salvation." As one observer has said, "all that Pope Pius IX did in this sentence was to bring forward certain pertinent theological truths which had always been taught in the Catholic schools and which must be considered if we are to understand the teaching about the necessity of the Church."[65]

---

[64] This contact is salvific in the sense that it satisfies the exigence of union with the Church; it is not, of course, salvific in the sense that all who possess it are assured of salvation.

[65] J. C. Fenton, *op. cit.*, 291.

The important thing for us to note here is that the Pope is clearly stating that actual membership in the Church is not required for salvation. At the same time he describes the dispositions which, without making a person a member, will unite him to the Church in the degree necessary to make salvation possible. These dispositions are perfectly consonant with the Bellarminian distinction between pertaining to the church *in re* and *in voto*. This distinction at once silences those who accuse the Church of condemning all non-Catholics to hell and preserves the absolute necessity of the visible Roman Catholic Church.

THIRD STATEMENT: The Holy Father is anxious that the previous statement be not misunderstood and taken as an exception to the Catholic teaching on the necessity of the Church. So he once again states that "it is a perfectly well-known Catholic dogma, that no one can be saved outside the Catholic Church. . . ." This is an absolute, unqualified statement. It forms the first part of a compound sentence, the second part of which we shall presently examine.

FOURTH STATEMENT: It is to be clearly understood that those who "are contumaciously against the authority" of the Church and "pertinaciously divided from the unity of that Church" are most certainly outside the Church and cannot attain salvation. Thus such people cannot qualify for that salvific attachment to the Church which is spoken of in statement number two. It would be a complete distortion of the meaning of this text to interpret it as saying that the whole matter of this necessity of the Church really comes down to this: those who are contumaciously not members of the Church cannot be saved. Such is not the meaning here. Two distinct statements are made in this sentence. First, no one outside the Church can be saved; second, those contumaciously separated from the Church are completely outside the Church and thus cannot be saved. In view of the many Catholics who were afflicting the Church in his day, the Pontiff makes it clear that there is no reason, either political (v.g. the "Italian" or "Roman" question) or economic, which will justify any man being "contumacious against the authority of that same Church, "or pertinaciously divided from the unity of that Church." It would be a serious mistake to understand this statement as meaning that only those who are culpably outside the Church cannot attain salvation.[66]

3. SUMMARY

The statements of Pius IX are permeated with a different tone than the explanations given by the theologians of this period. The latter were practically unanimous in holding that this doctrine was concerned only with those culpably outside the Church. Pius IX states it as an absolute principle that there is no salvation outside the Church; he attaches no reservations or conditions. He maintains that a person completely separated from the Church, that is without any attachment to it, cannot be saved. In regard to those outside the Church through invincible ignorance he is content to say that God will not punish them for their ignorance; this is a negative statement which in no way excuses these same people from the necessity of establishing an attachment to the Church. Pius IX does not elevate this ignorance into a means of salvation. The theologians, in developing their explanations make a distinction in regard to the Church herself, v.g. between the body and soul of the Church; or in the type of means of salvation which the Church constitutes, v.g. the ordinary way of salvation. Pius IX however places his distinction in the manner in which a person it attached to the Church. What he demanded was *some* attachment to the Church and without giving scientific precision to just what type of attachment was required, he does make several statements which help us to understand the union of which he is speaking.

First he is adamant in stating that the doctrine does not demand actual membership in the Church as a requisite for salvation. Secondly, a person in invincible ignorance who assiduously observes the natural law, is ready to obey God and who lives an honest and upright life, can be saved. Thus such a person by his dispositions achieves some union with the Church. Yet this union is short of membership. Without explicitly employing the Bellarminian distinction of belonging to the Church *in re* and *in voto,* the Pope is clearly speaking of those people who are attached to the Church by at least an implicit desire and who can be said to be in the Church by desire.

---

[66] *Ibid.,* 301. See below, 118.

Pope Pius IX sees the Church as absolutely necessary for every man; but the ways in which a man may be united to the Church are varied. The one visible Roman Catholic Church is the social unit to which all who are saved must be united in some way at the moment of death. Their salvation depends upon the Church influencing their lives in some way. This insistence upon *some* union with the Church is not general in the writings of the theologians. Some stated the doctrine concerned only those culpably living outside the Church. Others regarded the Church as the ordinary way of salvation. Another group used the body-soul distinction. Only three authors had an explanation which is in harmony with the view of Pope Pius IX: Gousset and Murray who used the *in re-in voto* distinction and Schrader who held that the Church was necessary with the necessity of both means and precept. However Gousset also used the body-soul distinction as well as the statement that the doctrine concerned only those culpably outside the Church. Murray did not incorporate the *in re-in voto* distinction into the body of his treatment. Schrader is extremely brief. Thus there was little conformity between the general tone of the theologians and the approach of Pope Pius IX. We might well ask what authors Pope Pius IX used in preparing his statements. We can only surmise. But it is certainly worth noting that both Schrader and Franzelin were teaching at the Roman College during this period. Both were highly regarded as their work in preparation for the Vatican Council indicates. Franzelin's view of this doctrine is completely in harmony with Pope Pius IX as we shall see in chapter three. Schrader's writing was brief. The man himself was undoubtedly more expressive. Quite possibly it was Schrader and Franzelin who influenced the thought of Pope Pius IX.

CHAPTER II

The Vatican Council and Its Aftermath

1. THE COUNCIL

Pius IX suspended the Vatican Council for an indefinite period with the Bull *Postquam Dei munere,* which was dated October 20, 1870. The Fathers of the Council had not finished their discussion of the schema *De ecclesia Christi.* Therefore we cannot quote from this Council any definitive statement regarding the necessity of the Church. Nevertheless the schema prepared for the Council's consideration contains two sections or chapters devoted to this doctrine. In addition we can read some of the *adnotationes* which are revisions suggested for the text of the chapters. It is essential to bear in mind that these texts do not represent authentic, definitive statements of the *magisterium.*

Chapter six of the schema is entitled, "The Church is a society which is absolutely necessary in order to attain salvation."[1] In this chapter the Church is said to be "absolutely necessary, not only with the necessity of precept . . . but also of means."[2] The foundation of this necessity is found in the need of union with the Mystical Body of Christ; it is also clear that one can participate in divine life only in and through the Church.[3]

---

[1] "Caput VI. Ecclesiam esse societatem ad salutem consequendam omnino necessariam." *Sacororum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio.* Ed. by J. Mansi, Vol. 51, col. 541.

[2] "[Ecclesiam] esse omnino necessariam, et quidam necessitate non tantum praecepti . . . sed etiam medii." *Ibid.,* col. 569.

[3] The full text of the chapter reads: "Hinc omnes intelligant (9), quam necessaria ad salutem obtinendam societas sit ecclesia Christi. Tantae nimirum necessitatis, quantae consortium et coniunctio est cum Christo capite et mystico eius corpore, praeter quod nullam aliam communionem ipse nutrit et fovet tanquam ecclesiam suam, quam solam dilexit et seipsum tradidit pro ea, ut illam sanctificaret, mundans lavacro aquae in verbo vitae: ut exhiberet ipse sibi gloriosam ecclesiam, non habentem maculam, aut rugam, aut aliquid huiusmodi, sed ut sit sancta et immaculata. Idcirco docemus,

Chapter seven is entitled, "Outside the Church no one can be saved." The text of this chapter is important as it was the object of rather detailed debate among the Fathers of the Council, several suggestions being advanced and several objections made against the wording of the text. Therefore it seems advisable to present the exact text of the chapter and then to consider the *adnotationes* made concerning it.

The first section of the chapter is the portion of interest to us. It reads:

> Further it is a dogma of faith, that outside the Church no one can be saved. However those who are in invincible ignorance concerning Christ and His Church, will not be condemned to eternal punishment because of this ignorance, since they are bound by no guilt in this matter before the eyes of God who wishes all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth, and who will not deny grace to an individual who is doing what he can, so that the person can attain justification and eternal life. But no one attains this who departs from this life culpably separated from the communion of the Church.[4]

As the long second sentence reads in the above texts, it states that it is possible for those in invincible ignorance to attain salvation. In doing so, it makes no explicit statements that such people

---

ecclesiam non liberam societatem esse, quasi indifferens sit ad salutem, eam sive nosse sive ignorare, sive ingredi sive relinquere; sed esse omino necessariam, et quidem necessitate non tantum praecepti dominici, quo Salvator omnibus gentibus eam ingrediendam praescripsit; verum etiam medii, quia in instituto salutaris providentiae ordine communicatio sancti Spiritus, participatio veritatis et vitae non obtinetur, nisi in ecclesia et per ecclesiam, cuius caput est Christus." *Ibid.*, col. 541.

[4] "Caput VII. Extra ecclesiam salvari neminem posse. (10) Porro dogma fidei est, extra ecclesiam salvari neminem posse. Neque tamen, qui circa Christum eiusque ecclesiam invincibili ignorantia laborant. (11), propter hanc ignorantiam poenis aeternis damnandi sunt, cum nulla obstingantur huiusce rei culpa ante oculos Domini, qui vult omnes homines salvos fieri et ad agnitionem veritatis venire, quique facienti quod in se est non denegat gratiam, ut justificationem et vitam aeternam consequi possit: sed hanc nullus consequitur, qui a fidei unitate vel ab ecclesiae communione culpabiliter seicunctus ex hac vita decedit." *Loc. cit.*

must be attached to the Church. Consequently some of the Fathers of the Council objected that this sentence might be interpreted as an exception to the necessity of the Church. So they proposed a revision of the text which reads: "If they attain this [justification and eternal life], they are not on that account saved outside the Church; for all the justified pertain to the Church either *in re or in voto.*"[5] However the records of the sessions report that "since the formula, *sive re sive voto,* was not pleasing to many of the consultors, it seemed sufficient to declare explicitly that no one can be saved who departs from this life separated from the Church through his own fault, while it is understood to be implicitly signified that whoever is saved cannot be completely or as they say, simply, outside the Church."[6]

This was, in effect a return to the original text of the chapter which gave rise to the first objection. Therefore a third suggestion was made calling for an explicit statement in the text of the necessity of some connection with the Church for all who are saved. This would be accomplished by inserting the phrase, "who pertains to the Church of Christ in no way," so that the text would read: "however no one attains this [justification and eternal life] who pertains to the Church of Christ in no way, and who departs from this life culpably separated from the unity of faith and the communion of the Church."[7] This would be the extent of explicit changes in the text. However the proponents of this change explained at length what they meant by the inserted phrase: "*who in no way,* they said, *pertain to the Church,* that is, who *look toward neither the body of the Church nor the soul of the*

---

[5] "Quam (justificationem et vitam aeternam) si consequuntur, non ideo extra ecclesiam salvantur: omnes enim justificati ad ecclesiam sive re sive voto pertinent." *Ibid.,* col. 570.

[6] "Verum quoniam formula, *sive re sive voto,* pluribus Consultoribus, non arridebat, visum est sufficere, si declaretur explicite, nullum fieri salvum, qui ob propriam culpam ab ecclesia seiunctus ex hac vita decedit, dum implicite, significatum intelligatur, non posse penitus vel simpliciter, ut aiunt, extra ecclesiam esse, quicumque salvus fiet." *Loc. cit.*

[7] ". . . hanc tamen nullus consequitur, qui ad Christi ecclesiam nullatenus pertinet et a fidei unitate vel ab ecclesiae communione culpabiliter seiunctus ex hac vita decedit." *Ibid.,* col. 570-571.

Church, and therefore pertain to the Church in no way, *namely neither in re nor in voto.*"[8]

This was the state of the discussion when the Council was suspended. We can see that there existed certainly among the Fathers of the Council a difference of opinion regarding the terminology to be employed. The text of the schema seemed to some to be deficient in not explicitly demanding some union with the Church on the part of all the saved. They proposed the insertion of the terminology *in re aut in voto.* This terminology was not pleasing to a second group of Fathers who thought it sufficient to state explicitly that no one culpably outside the Church could be saved. A third proposal would insert the general phrase "who pertains to the Church of Christ in no way"; this would avoid mention of the *in re aut in voto* terminology which was unacceptable to the second group; yet it states explicitly the need of some attachment to the Church, which was the desire of the first amenders. This general phrase was then explained by using both the body-soul and the *in re aut in voto* distinctions.

Thus in considering the chapters of this schema and the *adnotationes* it is of vital importance to bear in mind the presence of this difference in views among the Fathers and realize that this difference *was not resolved* by a definitive conciliar statement. So the importance of the Vatican Council is not centered upon anything it said but rather upon the all-important fact that it bequeathed to theologians an un-resolved theological discussion embodying different views.

2. POST-CONCILIAR AUTHORS

The years following the Vatican Council were years of great theological activity. In the wake of this activity, renewed attention was given to the doctrine of the Church's necessity. In 1873 Louis Brugere, professor at the seminary of St. Sulpice wrote "concerning the necessity of entering into the true Church of

---

[8] "*Qui nullatenus,* inquiebant, *ad ecclesiam pertinet,* id est, qui *neque spectat ad ecclesiae corpus, neque ad ecclesiae animam;* ideoque nullo modo pertinet ad ecclesiam, videlicet *neque in re neque in voto. Loc. cit.*

Christ and adhering to it."[9] This necessity was expressed in the axiom, "outside the Church, no salvation." This axiom can be understood in two senses:

> 1. Those who remain culpably outside the true Church of Christ, can in no way be saved. They will incur positive damnation. . . . 2. Those also who are inculpably outside the true Church of Christ lack certain means of salvation placed there; and hence the fruit of salvation will not be attained by a person who needs these means in order to save himself; although certainly he will never be judged except in accordance with his own merits and demerits.[10]

Brugere is emphatic in rejecting the body-soul explanation which he labels a mere tautology equivalent to: "Outside the collection of the just, there are no just."[11] Brugere is identical in wording to the anonymous *De ecclesia* which appeared at St. Sulpice in 1867, thus indicating his reliance upon that earlier work.[12]

On December 27, 1874, John Henry Newman wrote an answer to the vehement *Expostulation* of Mr. Gladstone. This answer took the form of a letter to the Duke of Norfolk; from this literary form the work has taken its title. Section nine of this rather long "letter" is entitled: "The Vatican Definition." Newman's explanation of the definition takes the form of explaining the various limitations of papal infallibility. He explains that the Pope may use this power in a positive way, in defining doctrine, or in a negative way, in condemning various propositions. In the field of morals, most of the statements from the Pope have been negative ones. The negative statements bring Newman to "another and large consideration, which is one of the best illustrations that I can give of that principle of minimizing so necessary, as I think, for a wise and cautious theology."[13] For in these negative statements, all the Church or the Pope is doing is calling attention to the fact that there is something erroneous, heretical, etc., in the work or thesis cited and that theologians should "keep clear of it."[14] It is then the work of the theologians to determine exactly what is condemned and while they usually succeed in doing so, their finding is not *de fide;* all that is *de fide* is that there is something erroneous in the thesis cited. And often later theologians reverse the opinion of early ones, so that what was formerly thought to have been implied by the condemnation, is no longer thought to be implied. Newman concludes: "In these cases, which in a true sense may be called the Pope's negative enunciations, the opportunity of a legitimate minimizing lies in the intensely concrete character of the matters condemned. . . ."[15]

---

[9] "De necessitate veram Christi Ecclesiam iniendi et ei adhaerendi." L. Brugere, *De ecclesia Christi* (Paris 1873) 284.

[10] "1. Qui culpabiliter extra veram Christi Ecclesiam manet, nequamquam poterit in altera vita salvari et damnationem incurret positivam. . . . 2. Qui etiam inculpabiliter extra veram Christi Ecclesiam versatur, quibusdam carebit mediis salutis illic positis, et proinde salutis fructus, si qui sint, quod nonnisi per ista media obtinuisset vel recuperasset, non consequetur, licet certe numquam citra ipsius merita vel demerita sit judicandus. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

[11] "Extra collectiones justorum, non dantur justi." *Ibid.,* 285.

[12] See above, 14.

Newman then turns to the consideration of the Pope's positive statements and says that here also there is an opportunity for legitimate minimizing, afforded by these statements being "more or less abstract."[16] He here explains his general view of the dogmas of the Church:

> Indeed, excepting such as relate to persons, that is, to the Trinity in Unity, the Blessed Virgin, the Saints and the like, all the dogmas of Pope or of Council are but general, and so far, in consequence, admit of exceptions in their actual application,—these exceptions being determined either by other authoritative utterances, or by the scrutinizing vigilance, acuteness, and subtlety of the *Schola Theologorum.*[17]

---

[13] John Henry Newman, *A Letter Addressed to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk on the Occasion of Mr. Gladstone's Recent Expostulation* (N. Y. 1875) 157.

[14] *Ibid.,* 158.

[15] *Ibid.,* 159.

[16] *Loc. cit.*

[17] *Loc. cit.*

Turning to examples of this minimizing, he takes up the question of the necessity of the Church:

> One of the most remarkable instances of what I am insisting on is found in a dogma, which no Catholic can ever think of disputing, viz., that "Out of the Church, and out of the faith, is no salvation." Not to go to Scripture, it is the doctrine of St. Ignatius, St. Irenaeus, St. Cyprian in the first three centuries, as of St. Augustine and his contemporaries in the fourth and fifth. It can never be other than an elementary truth of Christianity; and the present Pope has proclaimed it as all Popes, doctors, and bishops before him. But that truth has two aspects, according as the force of the negative falls upon the "Church" or upon the "salvation." The main sense is, that there is no other communion or so-called Church, but the Catholic, in which are stored the promises, the sacraments, and other means of salvation; the other and derived sense is, that no one can be saved who is not in that one and only Church. But it does not follow, because there is no Church but one which has the Evangelical gifts and privileges to bestow, that therefore no one can be saved without the intervention of that one Church. Anglicans quite understand this distinction: for on the one hand, their Article says, "They are to be had accursed (anathematizandi) that presume to say, that every man shall be saved *by* (in) the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature"; while on the other hand they speak of and hold out the doctrine of the "uncovenanted mercies of God." The latter doctrine in its Catholic form is the doctrine of invincible ignorance—or, that it is possible to belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body; and, at the end of 1,800 years, it has been formally and authoritatively put forward by the present Pope (the first Pope, I suppose, who has done so), on the very same occasion on which he has repeated the fundamental principle of exclusive salvation itself. It is to the purpose here to quote his words; they occur in the course of his Encyclical, addressed to the Bishops of Italy, under the date of August 19, 1863:
>
> "We and you know, that those who lie under invincible ignorance as regards our most Holy Religion, and who, diligently observing the natural law and its precepts,

> which are engraven by God on the hearts of all, and prepared to obey God, lead a good and upright life, are able, by the operation of the power of divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life."
>
> Who would at first sight gather from the wording of so forcible a universal, than an exception to its operation, such as this, so distinct, and, for what we know, so very wide, was consistent with holding it?[18]

Thus Newman sees this to be, as other dogmas, a universal statement which admits of exception in its actual application. In its main sense it points up the fact that the Church is the only Church "in which are stored the promises, the sacraments and the other means of salvation." The derived sense is that no one can be saved "who is not in that one and only Church." And yet strangely enough, that does not mean that "no one can be saved without the intervention of that one Church." For there are exceptions to this necessity and they are described in Catholic theology by the "doctrine of invincible ignorance—or, that it is possible to belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body. . . ." Although we have already seen frequent use of the body-soul explanation among earlier theologians, it is here in the writing of Newman that for the first time we find explicit mention that this explanation in reality describes exceptions in the application of this dogma. Newman treats the dogma obliquely, yet he presents a complete exposition of his view concerning this doctrine. Due to the over-powering influence of the author, this explanation could not but attain wide diffusion.

Marotte's *Cours complet d'instruction chrétienne* appeared in 1875 in its eighth edition which had been "corrected and augmented in conformity with the canons of the Vatican Council." He uses the body-soul explanation[19] and regards the axiom as applicable to those who remain outside the Church due to morally culpable negligence.[20]

G. Jansen, professor at the seminary of La Rioja (Argentina) writing in 1875 states that the Church is "a means and the only means to the end, which is the eternal salvation of men; so that he who wishes to attain salvation, is obliged to enter that Church."[21] In explaining the meaning of the axiom, he writes:

---

[18] *Ibid.*, 159-161.

[19] See L. P. Marotte, *Cours complet d'instruction chrètiene* (Paris 1875) 55.

[20] See *ibid.*, 56.

> Concerning the demonstrated sense of the dogma, these are to be noted: a) by proclaiming this dogma we are determining nothing concerning the salvation of anyone in particular; we do not declare *who* are saved, but generally we establish *what* universally and *objectively is necessary for salvation,* namely that they pertain with necessity of means to the soul of the Church, and by the necessity of precept to the body also. Hence it is understood b) that since man can pertain to the soul of the Church without being of its body and can be inculpably ignorant of the precept, only those are outside the way of salvation and, while they remain in that state, are said to be unable to attain salvation, who are living *culpably* in heresy, schism or infidelity or who are formal heretics, schismatics or infidels.[22]

The author separates the necessity of means and precept, applying the former only to the soul of the Church, the latter to the body.

Another author in the same year, 1875, proposed much the same explanation. Vincent states that it is necessary with the necessity of precept to belong to the body of the Church; those inculpably outside the body, belong to the soul and thus can be saved.[23]

---

[21] "Ecclesia necessaria dicitur quatenus, supposita Ecclesiae institutione, intelligitur esse medium, et medium unicum ad finem, quae est salus aetera hominum, ita ut, qui salutem aeternam consequi velit, obligetur ad ingrediendum Ecclesiam," G. M. Jansen, *Praelectiones theologiae fundamentalis* (Utrecht 1875) 343.

[22] "De sensu probati dogmatis haec notanda. a) Proclamando hoc dogma nihil quidpiam decernimus de salute alicujus in particulari, non declaramus, *qui* salvantur, sed generatim statuimus quid universim et *objective necessarium sit ad salutem,* scil. ut necessitate medii ad animam, necessitate praecepti etiam ad corpus Ecclesiae pertineant. Inde intelligitur b) quod, cum homo ad animam Ecclesiae pertinere possit quin sit de corpore ejus, et inculpabiliter ignorare possit praeceptum, ii solummodo extra viam salutis versari et, dum in eo statu permanent, salutem consequi non posse dicendi sint, qui *culpabiliter* in haeresi, schismate, vel infidelitate degunt, seu qui sunt haeretici schismatici, infideles formales." *Ibid.,* 345.

[23] See Vincent, *Compendium universae theologicae* (Paris 1875) 249 ff.

Magnasco in 1876 without treating the question directly, states that Christ placed all the means of salvation in the Church and there is no other Church in which they can be found.[24]

Francis Perriot, writing from the seminary of Langres in 1876, states that, "Men are obliged to enter the Church established by Christ."[25] This is founded upon a divine precept so that those who are culpably outside the Church are found in the way of "certain damnation."[26] In regard to the axiom, Perriot understands it to mean that those culpably outside the visible society cannot be saved. Those inculpably outside the Church can be saved as often as God moves them toward salvation by extraordinary means.[27]

Hugo Hurter's *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium* was one of the more popular theological works of the late nineteenth century. It appeared first in 1876 and by 1909 had gone through twelve editions. In the first edition, he expresses the doctrine of the Church's necessity in these words: "The Church, which Christ established that men might attain salvation through it and in it, is so necessary to attain this end, that he who departs from this life culpably outside it, cannot obtain salvation."[28] In explaining this statement Hurter makes four observations. First, supernatural happiness is an end to which we have no right; therefore God has every right to decide under what conditions he will grant it to us. Secondly, ". . . someone can pertain to the Church actually, or also merely by desire and disposition of soul, as the person who is constituted outside the true Church, of which he is ignorant, and is of such a disposition of mind that he has the firm intention of doing everything which God has established to attain salvation. For in this general intention, there is implicitly included, that special intention of entering the true Church, as soon as he comes to a certain knowledge of it."[29] Thirdly, Hurter states that his proposition is not concerned with those who belong to the Church *in voto,* since if they are not saved, it is not because they are outside the Church, but rather for some sin not forgiven. Fourthly, he informs us that his proposition is concerned with those who "knowing the true Church do not wish to enter it or who through culpable negligence (of which God alone is the judge) do not take the care to find the true Church and hence neglect to enter it; it is customary to say that they are outside the Church not in good faith, but in bad faith."[30]

---

[24] See S. Magnasco, *Institutiones theologiae* (Genoa 1876) 1.229.

[25] "Homines ad ingrediendam Ecclesiam a Christo institutam obligari." F. Perriot, *Praelectiones theologiae dogmaticae* (Langres 1876) 30.

[26] ". . . ita ut, si culpabiliter extra eam reperiantur, in statu certae damnationis existant." *Loc. cit.*

[27] See *ibid.*, 38.

[28] "Ecclesia, quam Christus instituit ut homines in ea et per eam salutem consequantur, ita ad hunc finem obtinendum est necessaria, ut qui extra eam propria consituit culpa ex hac vita decedunt, salutem nequeant obtinere." H. Hurter, *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium* (Oeniponte 1878) 1.190.

While Hurter recognizes two ways of pertaining to the Church: *in re* and *in voto,* he phrases his thesis so as to consider only those who are culpably outside the Church, thus emphasizing the necessity of precept.

In his *Tractatus de romano pontifice cum prolegomeno de ecclesia,* Dominic Palmieri expresses the necessity of the Church in this statement: "The Church is necessary by divine institution for all men, with the necessity of means and of precept; therefore whoever may not have satisfied [the necessity of] this divine institution, cannot be saved."[31] He gives a brief explanation of the terms, necessity of means and necessity of precept: "That which is really a means is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means, and therefore unless it is had, at least in some way, salvation is not obtained. A thing said to be necessary with mere necessity of precept, if it must be done by us so that we may preserve the moral order."[32] The words, *at least in some way,* used in reference to the necessity of means call for further explanation. He writes: "We said in the definition of necessity of means: *unless it is had, at least in some way;* for that which is necessary with the necessity of means, can frequently be used by an adult in two ways (since an adult is not condemned without his own actual guilt) namely *in re vel in voto,* indeed with a desire joined to another, for example charity or contrition; this desire can even be an implicit one."[33] Palmieri's theological arguments for the necessity of means are based upon the necessity of faith, the necessity of baptism, and the necessity of having some union with the Mystical Body. The necessity of precept is obvious in Sacred Scripture. (Mk. 16, 16.)

---

[29] ". . . posse aliquem ad Ecclesiam actu, vel etiam solum voto et animi dispositione pertinere, ut si quis extra Ecclesiam veram, quam ignorat, constitutus ita animo est dispositus, ut firmum habeat propositum faciendi omnia quae Deus constituit ad assequendam salutem. In hoc enim proposito generali implicite latet et illud speciale ingrediendi Ecclesiam veram, mox ac illam certo cognoscat." *Loc. cit.*

[30] "Nos loqui de his, qui veram Ecclesiam cognoscentes eam nolunt ingredi, vel qui culpabili negligentia (cujus solus Deus judex est) non curant veram invenire Ecclesiam, et hinc eam ingredi negligunt, qui proinde, ut dici solet, non sunt bona, sed mala fide extra Ecclesiam." *Ibid.,* 191.

[31] "Ecclesia Christi est necessaria ex divina institutione omnibus homnibus necessitate medii et praecepti; ideoque qui huic divinae institutioni non fecerint satis, salvi esse non possunt." D. Palmieri, *Tractatus de romano pontifice cum prologomeno de ecclesia* (Prati 1891) 15.

In regard to the body and soul of the Church, Palmieri distinguishes what may be called two bodies and two souls. The body formally signifies those elements which constitute the external form of the Church such as the ministry of pastors, the subjection of the people by the profession of faith and communion of sacraments. Materially, the body of the Church can indicate those persons who are bound together by these elements. Likewise in regard to the soul of the Church, that term can signify the principles of supernatural operation and merit, namely the interior gift of faith, sanctifying grace, etc. It can also signify those individuals in whom these elements are found. Thus it is possible to distinguish a twofold formal principle in the Church, "one exterior by which the society is constituted; the other interior, in which consists the supernatural life of the members."[34]

---

[32] "Necessarium necessitate medii ad salutem illud est quod est reapse medium, ut idcirco sine ipso habito, aliquo saltem modo, salus non obtineatur. Necessarium mera necessitate praecepti illud dicitur, quod faciendum nobis est ut moralem ordinem custodiamus." *Ibid.,* 16.

[33] "Posuimus in definitione necessarii necessitate medii: *sine ipso, aliquo saltem modo, habito;* nam id quod necessarium est necessitate medii, potest frequenter dupliciter praestari ab adulto (quoniam adultus citra suam actualem culpam non damnatur), nempe vel *in re vel in voto,* voto nimirum coniuncto alteri actui puta caritatis vel contritionis, quod votum et implicitum esse potest." *Ibid.,* 16-17.

[34] "Ex dictis porro consequitur, duplex distinguendum esse principium formale in Ecclesia, alterum exterius, quo societas constituitur, alterum interius, in quo vita supernaturalis membrorum consistit." *Ibid.,* 41.

These distinctions in regard to the body and soul of the Church could easily form the basis for an explanation of the Church's necessity which we have encountered frequently: it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church, not the body. It is rather remarkable that Palmieri does not even allude to such an explanation. When he comes to speak of the necessity of the Church, he does not incorporate or even refer to his view concerning the body and the soul of the Church.

August Leboucher in 1877 states: "The Church is a necessary society, so that no other society exists in which men can be saved."[35] The sense of the thesis is that every man must pertain to the Church in some way in order to be saved: "We say in the thesis that adherence to the Church is necessary for salvation; but it is to be noted that a man can pertain to the Church in a twofold way, namely actually or in desire."[36] Further this desire can be implicit or explicit: "However this desire in no way requires knowledge of the Church, for it consists only in the firm purpose of following all that God has instituted for salvation. Hence it can exist both in the person who is completely ignorant of the Church and in one who knowing it, thinks, with invincible error, that it is false."[37]

The reason why this desire suffices is God's free acceptance of it: "Although this desire is not sufficient that someone be really aggregated to the external body of the Church, nevertheless, according to Catholic doctrine, it is accepted by the most merciful God, as supplying for actual adherence and taking its place."[38]

---

[35] "Ecclesia est societas necessaria, ita ut alia non existat societas in qua homines salvari possint." A. Leboucher, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Paris 1877) 45.

[36] "Dicimus in thesi quod Ecclesiae adhaesio necessaria est ad salutem, sed notandum est aliquem ad Ecclesiam duplici modo pertinere posse, actu scilicet, vel tantum in voto." *Ibid.,* 45-46.

[37] "Istud autem votum nullo modo requirit necessario cognitionem Ecclesiae nam unice consistit in firmo proposito exequendi omnia quae Deus forsan instituit ad salutem: hinc existere potest, tum in eo qui Ecclesiam penitus ignorat, tum in eo qui, illam cognoscens, invincibili errore putat eam esse falsam." *Ibid.,* 46.

[38] "Porro licet istud votum non sufficiat ut quis reipsa aggregetur corpori externo Ecclesiae, tamen, juxta doctrinam catolicam, a Deo benignissimo acceptatur, ut supplens adhaesionem actualem, et ejus tenens locum." *Ibid.,* 46.

Thus Leboucher does not utilize the body-soul distinction at all; nor does he speak of those inculpably outside the Church as not being included in this doctrine. He simply states the absolute necessity of the Church for all men and then explains how men can pertain to this Church in a manner sufficient to render salvation possible. The basic theological reason he advances for this doctrine is the absolute necessity of pertaining to the Mystical Body in order to be a partaker in the life of Christ.[39]

In October 1848, Camillus Mazzella was called to Rome by Pope Leo XIII to fill the chair of theology at the Roman College left vacant by the elevation of Father Franzelin to the Cardinalate. In 1880 he published his *De religione et ecclesia.* In treating of the necessity of the Church he first explains the terms, necessity of means and of precept; also body and soul of the Church. Necessity of means is that which, even inculpably omitted, renders salvation impossible; necessity of precept is that which is necessary merely because it is commanded. The soul of the Church consists of sanctifying grace, faith, hope and charity; the body is the external visible apparatus.[40] He then declares: ". . . it is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church . . . it is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the body of the Church at least in desire."[41] Whenever we speak of the necessity of pertaining to the body of the Church *in re,* this must be understood only as necessity of precept, from which both invincible ignorance and impossibility will excuse. The Church is the ordinary means of communicating faith and the other things necessary for salvation with the necessity of means. Those inculpably outside the Church can be supplied with these things through the extraordinary providence of God; those culpably outside cannot in any way benefit from this extraordinary providence.[42]

---

[39] See *ibid.,* 47.

[40] See C. Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia* (Prati 1880) 393.

[41] ". . . necessarium esse necessitate *medii* pertinere ad *animam* Ecclesiae . . . necessarium quidem esse necessitate medii pertinere saltem in voto ad Ecclesiae corpus." *Ibid.,* 394.

[42] See *ibid.,* 401-402.

DeBrouwer, in 1881, asks the question: "Whether the eternal salvation of men is the proper end of the Church, so that outside of it men cannot attain salvation."[43] In answer he advances two propositions: "1. Eternal salvation of men is the proper end of the Church so that outside of it, this cannot be obtained. The Church therefore is a necessary society. 2. It is necessary however with a twofold necessity, both of means and of precept."[44] The Church is a necessary means and even if it is inculpably omitted, salvation is unattainable. The causality of this means cannot be supplied for by the ignorance of the agent.[45] However the author continues that what is necessary with the necessity of means can frequently be used in two ways: "namely actually or in desire, a desire which is joined to another act, for example charity or contrition, so that this desire can be an implicit one."[46] Like Leboucher, De Brouwer states that the Church is absolutely necessary, but that it is a means which can be used either actually or in desire.

At this point it is necessary to leave the actual explanations of the theologians and consider a work which influenced this doctrine indirectly yet profoundly. Generally it is not always easy to gauge accurately the influence of any single work upon a given doctrine. Yet occasionally one encounters a work of classic proportion which, by bringing a radically new orientation to a question, casts it in dimensions which it did not previously possess. Such a work, in relation to the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation, is the five volume *Le christianisme et le temps present* by Emile Bougaud. It was published during the years 1872-84. The volume which interests us most closely is volume four, which appeared in

---

[43] "Utrum salus aeterna hominum ita est Ecclesiae finis proprius ut extra eam obtinere non possit?" F. M. Brouwer, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, 2nd ed. (Brugis 1891) 38.

[44] "I. Salus aeterna hominum ita est Ecclesiae finis proprius ut extra ipsam obtineri non possit. Ecclesia igitur est societas necessarius. II. Necessaria autem est duplici necessitate, tum medii, tum praecept." *Loc. cit.*

[45] See *ibid.*, 39.

[46] ". . . nempe vel in re vel in voto, voto nimirum conjuncto alteri actui, puta caritatis vel contritionis, quod votum et implicitum esse potest." *Ibid.*, 40.

1882.[47] This work is important not because of its explanation of the Church's necessity, but rather because the author develops therein concepts of the origin, nature and extension of the Church which represent a pronounced departure from the tradition of the classic Ecclesiologists. These concepts, bequeathed by the author to the theology of the latter decades of the 19th century, were to perdure for several decades of the twentieth century, thus bringing to the question of the Church's necessity a mode of explanation quite different from anything we have encountered so far.[48]

Chapter one of volume four is entitled "The Body of the Church." It is here we find the concepts mentioned above. Speaking of the origin of the Church, Bougaud writes: "Let us look first at the origin of the Church, the moment she appeared. What is that moment? Who can say? The origins of the Church are lost beyond all known things. To find the first seed of them it is necessary to go back beyond Jesus Christ, beyond Abraham, even beyond Adam, to that moment of which the evangelist has said, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God.' "[49]

The origin of the Church lies in the very society of the Three Divine Persons; for the purpose of the Church is to draw all men into this society and to return them to God. In fact the Church is designed to give men a share in that divine life even on this earth. Souls have been created "to live the very life of God, even on this earth; and it is for that reason, that at the very moment He created them, God instituted His Church, so that they could find, in that holy society, the light and the love for which

---

[47] E. Bougaud, *Le christianisme et le temps presents,* v. 4 (Paris 1882). This was called the second edition; but actually is the first as the earlier edition which appeared in 1871 was small and was withdrawn by the author before any sizable circulation.

[48] Lippert, Congar, and Nothomb provide a few examples of the longevity of Bougaud's views. See below, 178, 200, 310.

[49] "Regardons d'abord le berceau de l'Église, le moment où elle apparait. Quel est ce moment? Qui le dira? Les origines de l'Église se perdent par delà toutes les choses connues. Pour en trouver le premier germe, il faut remonter plus haut que Jesus-Christ, plus haut qu'Abraham, plus haut même qu'Adam, jusqu'à ce moment dont l'évangéliste a dit: In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum." *Ibid.,* 15.

He made them."[50] In view of this purpose, the Church can be called "the society of souls in light and love."[51] It is thus a divine society with the most sublime purpose of all the societies on the face of the earth. Nevertheless this society developed slowly and did not suddenly appear upon the earth in all its perfections. Four thousand years were required to prepare this great work: "In each age, there was added a trait, augmenting the light, perfecting the rites, spiritualizing the priesthood, until Jesus Christ came, who elevated everything: light, love, authority, hierarchy, to its ultimate beauty."[52] This development of the Church was similar to the process whereby God created the physical universe; it was a gradual process culminating always in a more perfect form: "But in changing form, the purpose remained the same: to unite souls with God and with one another in the sacred bond of love. Or rather the form of the Church was perfected only to satisfy a greater number of souls and to unite them in a more eminent light and in a more profound love."[53]

Thus for Bougaud the Church has its origin in the mystery of the Trinity; it has for its purpose the communication to men of the life of God; in function of this end it is definable in terms of the society of souls in light and love. This society developed slowly over the centuries until it was elevated and perfected by Christ.

Just as it is difficult to ascertain the exact beginning of the Church because of its sublime character and purpose, so too it is difficult to ascertain the extension of the Church because of the sublime character of its membership: "As we cannot define the origins of the Church, so too we cannot define its dimensions. By right, she is as wide as the world. She has been created for all souls. All belong to her without exception, in all places and in all times."[54]

---

[50] "Elles [souls] l'ont été pour vivre de la même vie que Dieu, même sur cette terre; et c'est pour cela qu'en même temps qu'il les creait, Dieu instituait son Église, afin qu'elles pussent trouver, dans cette societé sainte, la lumière et l'amour pour lesquelles il les a faites." *Ibid.,* 16.

[51] "C'est la societé des âmes dan la lumière et dans l'amour." *Loc. cit.*

[52] "A chaque siècle, il y ajoute un trait, augmentant la lumière, perfectionnant les rites, spiritualisant le sacerdoce, jusqu'à ce que vienne Jesus-Christ, qui élève tout: lumière, amour, autorité, hierarchie, a la dernière beauté." *Ibid.,* 17.

[53] "Mais, en changeant de forme, le but reste le même: unir les âmes ave Dieu et entre elles dans le lieu sacré de l'amour. Ou plutôt la forme de l'Église ne se perfectionne que pour saisir un plus grand nombre d'âmes et les unir dans une lumière plus haute et dans un amour plus profond." *Loc. cit.*

Human souls are the "material which compose the body of the Church."[55] All men are called to share in this divine life, in this society which is the society of light and love; consequently the extension of this society is enormous. Nevertheless the author insists that the Church does have definite limits; but a view of the Church which confines itself to these visible limits of the visible organism is severely restricted and fails to realize that there are secret prolongations of this society which go beyond its frontiers:

> Not that the Church has no fixed, definite limits. The Church is not a dispersion, a confused grouping. She has obvious exterior circumvallations, with a large visible door which is called baptism, and an invisible door which is called love. Only those are officially part of the Church who have entered through the visible door. But whoever would look at the Church only under this aspect would have a poor idea of her. She is more vast than this. She overflows her frontiers. She has in the shadow secret prolongations which capture the admiration.
>
> The Church, in effect, is the society of souls in divine love. Therefore whoever loves God, necessarily partakes of it. Whoever has conserved, in heresy or schism, a true love of God, is a living member of the Church. And it matters little that he has not received baptism, he belongs to it by right, like those children who, late at night, wander about their father's house, and because of the dark are not able to find the door.[56]

---

[54] "Comme on ne peut pas dire les origines de l'Église, on n'en peut pas dire les dimensions. En droit, elle est aussi vaste que le monde. Elle a été creée pour toutes les âmes. Toutes lui appartiennent sans exception, sous tous les cieux et dans tous les temps." *Ibid.,* 18.

[55] He refers to them as: ". . . matériaux qui conposent le corps de l'Église." *Ibid.,* 17.

[56] "Non pas que l'Église n'ait des limites precisés, areteés. L'Église, nous l'allons voir, n'est pas un éparpillement, un groupement confus. Elle a des circonvallations extérieures éclatantes, avec une grande porte visible qu'on appelle le baptême, et une port invisible qu'on appelle l'amour. Ceux-la seuls font officiellement partie de l'Église qui ont passé par la porte visible. Mais

To view the Church adequately, it is necessary to include within it all those who love God: "There is the first category of souls who share in the Church: souls who love God with a sincere love, whether they have been brought within the visible walls of the Church by the door of baptism, or whether they have been brought within the invisible circumvallations of the Church by the door of love."[57]

Nevertheless in order to possess a complete idea of the Church it is not sufficient to study its origin, the material which composes it, nor its magnificent extension. It is necessary to heed also the positive ordinance of God and to take account of the Church as God established it through Christ. The Church has been established as a visible society; according to the social needs of man. There is also a deeper reason for the visibility of this Church: "There was still another reason why the immense society of souls was not a dispersion, but a society and one visible society, obvious, easy to see and to find. Souls had been created free. God did not wish to throw them forcibly into the light and love. He had resolved not to admit them into the eternal Church of heaven, except on the condition that they had freely partaken of the Church on earth."[58]

---

qui ne verrait l'Église que sous cet aspect, en aurait une pauvre idée. Elle est autrement vaste. Elle deborde ses frontières. Elle a dans l'ombre de secrets prolongements qui ravissent d'admiration.

"L'Église, en affet, est la societé des âmes dans l'amour divin. Donc quiconque aime Dieu en fait necessairement partie. Quiconque a conservé dans l'hérésie ou dans le schisme un amour veritable de Dieu, est membre vivant de l'Église. Et même il importe peu qu'il ait pas reçu le baptême; il lui appartient de droit, comme ces enfants qui, attardés la soir, errent autour de la maison paternelle, et à cause des tenebres ne peuvent pas en trouver la porte." *Ibid.,* 18.

[57] "Voilà la première catégorie des âmes qui font partie de l'Église: les âmes qui aiment Dieu d'un amour sincère, soit qu'elles aient été introduites dans les mûrs visibles de l'Église par la porte du baptême, soit qu'elles aient été introduites dans les circonvallations invisibles de l'Église par la porte de l'amour." *Ibid.,* 20.

[58] "Il y avait encore d'autres raisons pour que l'immense societé des âmes ne fût pas un eparpillement, mais un societé, ut une societé visible, éclatante facile à voir et a trouver. Les âmes avaient été creeés libres. Dieu n'avait

There are three concepts exposed here by Bougaud which will provide the foundation for several unusual explanations of the Church's necessity. First, is Bougaud's definition of the Church as the "society of souls in light and love." Second is the view of the Church as being as "wide as the world." The third is that the Church has secret prolongations of herself and that entrance can be gained either by the "visible door of baptism," or the "invisible door of love." This Church to which he refers is obviously an enlarged Church, one of broader dimensions than the Roman Catholic Church. Membership in this "enlarged" Church can be gained by either grace or baptism. If such concepts were applied to the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation, it would be difficult to preserve any real meaning for that doctrine; it would be reducible to a mere tautology: outside grace there is no salvation. Unfortunately some apologists attempted to avoid the difficulties involved in the doctrine of the Church's necessity by employing Bougaud's concepts. Emmanuel Barbier, writing in 1924, complained of this tack among the apologists and was not slow to trace a goodly portion of responsibility to the concepts introduced by Bougaud. Barbier writes:

> Mgr. Bougaud had already considerably simplified the difficulty in defining the Church as: *the society of souls in light and love* (this is what he called the *body* of the Church). By means of this elastic definition, he had brought into the Church (into the body of the Church), all the souls who in the midst of heresy, of schism and even of idolatry, love God with a sincere love. He merely forgot to say whether this love ought to be supernatural, whether it supposes faith, and how one can have faith, the true faith, in heresy, in schism, and above all, in idolatry. In abstracting from these scholastic subtleties, he explained clearly to Christian men and women of the *present time* how all the souls of good faith can enter into the great society of souls by *the invisible door which is called love,* and become the *material of the body of the*

---

pas voulu les jeter fatalement dans la lumière et dans l'amour. Il avait resolu de ne les admettre dans l'Église éternelle du ciel qu'a la condition qu'elles auraient fait librement partie de l'Église de la terre." *Ibid.,* 24.

> *Church.* One would not find, perhaps, among the apologists to whom he opened the way, this more adventurous theory concerning the body of the Church, but they held it concerning the soul, and "this society in light and love," is indeed an enlarged Church which they are preaching."[59]

Thus Bougaud's ideas found quick acceptance, even though they were usually applied to the soul of the Church. We shall be able to trace in many of the subsequent approaches to the question of the Church's necessity the effect of Bougaud's views. Because of the profundity and grandeur of the spiritual concepts involved, because of the facile answer it provided for any objection against the doctrine, this approach was most appealing, but unfortunately at the same time, most unsatisfactory theologically since it enlarged the traditional Catholic concept of Church and removed much of the urgency from the necessity of the visible ecclesiastical body which men call the Roman Catholic Church.

Having noted the contribution of Emile Bougaud to the theology of his day, we can now return to the theologians who directly consider the doctrine of the Church's necessity.

J. B. Chère, professor at the seminary at Lons-le-Saunier, writes in 1884. He first distinguishes between necessity of means and precept. The former is either absolute or hypothetical; absolute if it must be used *in re;* hypothetical if it may be used *in re* or *in voto.* He then indicates that the Church is necessary for salvation with both necessity of precept and necessity of means; the latter being hypothetical.[60] He sums up his treatment in three statements: "There is salvation for no one who, conscious of the Church, remains outside it formally. There is salvation for no one who does not pertain to the Church at least in desire. There is salvation for no one who does not belong at least to the soul of the Church."[61] In 1885, Morere, in a book designed for the instruction of the young, states that it is not necessary to belong to the body of the Church, only to the soul; only those culpably outside the Church can not be saved.[62]

---

[59] "Dejà Mgr. Bougaud avait considérablement simplifié la difficulté en definissant l'Église: *la société des âmes dans la lumière et dans* l'amour (c'est ce qu'il appelait le *corps* de l'Eglise). Au moyen de cette élastique définition il faisait entrer dans l'Église (dans le corps de l'Eglise) toutes les âmes qui, au sein de l'hérésie, du schisme et même de l'idolâtrie, aiment Dieu d'un amour sincère. Il oubliait seulement de dire si cet amour doit être surnaturel, s'il suppose la foi, et comment on peut avoir la foi, la vraie foi, dans l'hérésie dans le schisme et surtout dans l'idolâtrie. En faisant abstraction de ces subtilités scolastiques, il expliquait clairement aux chrétiens et au chretiénnes des *temps présents* comment toutes les âmes de bonne foi peuvent entrer dans la grand société des âmes par *la porte invisible qu'on appelle l'amour,* et devenir les *matériaux du corps de l'Eglise.* On ne retrouverait peut-etre chez les apologistes auxquels il ouvrait la voie cette théorie plus qu'aventureuse sur le corps de l'Église, mais ils s'en tiennent à l'âme, et 'cette société dans la lumière et dans l'amour', c'est bien l'Église élargie qu'ils prechent." Emmanuel Barbier, *Histoire du catholicisme liberal et du catholicisme social en France* (Bordeaux 1924) 3.352-353.

The Sulpician professors at the seminary of Clairmont authored a compendium for the use of seminarians which seems to date from 1885. After describing the terms, necessity of precept, necessity of means, body and soul of the Church, it states: "It is clear that it is necessary with the necessity of means, and indeed intrinsically, to pertain to the soul of the Church."[63] Concerning the body: "However, it is admitted by all that it is not absolutely necessary for salvation for a person to belong to the body of the Church."[64] In regard to the body of the Church, the necessity therefore is only one of precept: "From the institution of Christ, all men are strictly bound to adhere to the body of the Church."[65] The authors clearly state that this signifies only necessity of precept. However in a scholium following this article, it is stated that there is also a necessity of means involved, since the Church is the ordinary means of salvation:

---

[60] See J. B. Chère, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Laedone: 1884).

[61] "Nemini salus qui, jam conscius Ecclesiae, seu formaliter, manet extra Ecclesiam—Nemini salus qui non pertinet saltem voto ad Ecclesiam—nemini salus, si saltem ad animam Ecclesiae non pertineat." *Ibid.*, 62.

[62] See B. Morere, *Noveau manuel d'apologetique chretiennes* (Paris 1885) 342-344.

[63] "Patet necessarium esse necessitate medii, et quidem intrinsece, pertinere ad animam Ecclesiae. . . ." Suplician Professors, *Theologia dogmatica et moralis* (Paris, 1889), 1.321.

[64] "At vero ab omnibus etiam admittitur non absolute necessarium esse ad salutem consequendam, ut quis pertineat ad corpus Ecclesiae. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

[65] "Ex Christi institutione, omnes homines stricte tenentur adhaerere corpori Ecclesiae." *Ibid.*, 332.

> But something more can be added; not only is entrance into the Church necessary with the necessity of precept; but it is also necessary with the necessity of means. The reason is because, according to the previous thesis concerning the end of the Church, the Church is the ordinary means which God has instituted to save men. For in the Church and there alone are to be found the legitimate mission to preach, the legitimate use of the sacraments, and other things which aid towards salvation. Hence Christ has ordained the Church as a means of salvation and entrance into it is necessary with the necessity of means. However the ordination of this means to salvation does not arise from the intrinsic nature of the means; this means can be supplied for by other extraordinary means. Hence it is not absolutely required that this means be used in reality; but in the case of impossibility, desire of it suffices and even an implicit desire, consisting namely in that disposition of soul by which one is prepared to do all God requires.[66]

Concerning those who are invincibly in error it states that God "will supply, by an extraordinary providence, faith and the other means necessary for salvation to one who does all that he can."[67] So here we find a combination of three explanations: it is necessary with necessity of means to belong to the soul of the Church, and with the necessity of precept to belong to the body; it is necessary to pertain to the body of the Church either *in re* or *in voto;* the Church is the ordinary means of salvation and there is an extraordinary providence for those who are invincibly ignorant of this means.

---

[66] "Sed aliquid amplius addi potest; non solum enim ingressus in Ecclesiam est necessarius necessitate praecepti, sed insuper est necessarius necessitate medii. Ratio est quia, juxta praecendentem thesim de fine Ecclesiae, Ecclesia est *medium ordinarium* quod Deus instituit ad salvandos homines; in Ecclesia enim, et quidem sola, adsunt legitima missio ad praedicandum, legitimus sacramentorum usus, et alia quae juvant ad salutem. Unde Christus ordinävit Ecclesiam ut medium ad salutem, et sic ingressus in eam est necessarius necessitate medii. Tamen ordinatio hujus medii ad salutem non oritur ex intrinseca natura medii; potest enim hoc medium aliis mediis extraordinariis suppleri. Unde non absolute requiritur ut illud medium adhibeatur in re, sed, in casu impossibilitatis, sufficit ejus votum, et quidem inplicitum, consistens nempe in ill animi dispositione, qua quis paratus est ad omnia facienda, quae Deus exegerit." *Ibid.,* 324.

[67] ". . . quippe Deus . . . providentia extraordinaria fidem aliaque media necessaria salutis facienti quod in se est suppeditabit. . . ." *Ibid.,* 325.

The *Praelectiones dogmaticae* of Christian Pesch appeared first in 1885 in manuscript form. By 1924 there had been seven editions. Our quotations are from the first printed edition, which appeared in 1894. Since this is identical with the 1885 edition, we will consider Pesch's explanation in this place. His proposition reads: "The Church of Christ is necessary to all men in order to attain salvation."[68] In explanation he writes: "That the Church is necessary to all men for salvation means nothing else than that *no one is saved who knowingly and willingly lives and dies outside the Church,* or all men, to whom the doctrine of Christ has been sufficiently proposed, are obliged to enter the Church."[69] The reason for this is the positive will of Christ."[70]

A man is not condemned merely because he is outside visible communion with the Church; for he may be saved through the possession of divine charity which "supplies for the inculpable lack of any other means." He explains: "For the necessity of being joined to the Church rises either from the fact that the Church is a means of salvation; but an act of charity supplies for the inculpable lack of all other means. Or it rises from the precept of Christ, but no one is guilty of violating a precept, if he is ignorant of it through no fault of his own. Therefore inculpable ignorance excuses from the observance of this precept. Therefore the person will be saved, who on one hand labors under inculpable ignorance and on the other acquires justification by formed faith, that is by an act of charity."[71] Such men however, are not altogether separated from the Church. They may be said to pertain to the soul of the Church and even to the body by implicit desire:

---

[68] "Ecclesia Christi omnibus hominibus ad salutem consequendam necessaria est." C. Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae* (Frieburg 1885) 1.277.

[69] "Ecclesiam esse hominibus ad salutem necessariam nihil aliud est nisi *neminem posse salvum fieri, qui sciens et volens extra ecclesiam vivat et moriatur,* seu omnem hominem, cui doctrina Christi sufficienter proposita est, obligari ad ecclesiam ingrediendam." *Loc. cit.*

[70] See *loc. cit.*

> Therefore whoever has within himself supernatural grace is rightly said to pertain to the soul of the Church. But at the same time he pertains to the body of the Church in some way, i.e. to the visible society itself. For how can he elicit an act of charity toward God, unless he is compliant to the will of God in all things? However the will of God demands of him that he enter the Church; therefore by an implicit proposition of his will, or by desire, as they say, he pertains to the Church, even though he has not entered the Church actually. This is so because he is inculpably ignorant of the precept of God. Therefore actually to be or to become a member of the Church is a necessity of precept for each adult man; to be a member of the Church in desire is of absolute necessity of means; from this necessity, no ignorance excuses, because any adult should have the will of following the divine precepts in all things, at least those which oblige *sub gravi*.[72]

---

[71] "Necessitas enim se adiungendi ecclesiae aut inde oritur, quod ecclesia est medium salutis; sed actus caritatis supplet defectum inculpabilem omnis alius medii. Aut oritur ex praecepto Christi; violati autem praecepti nemo reus est, qui illud sine sua culpa ignorat. Ergo inculpabilis ignorantia ab observantia huius praecepti excusat. Ille igitur, qui ex una parte laborat hac inculpabili ignorantia, ex altera vero parte fide formata, i.e., actu caritatis, iustificationem acquirit et in hoc statu moritur, salvus erit." *Ibid.,* 278.

[72] "Quare quicumque habet in se gratiam supernaturalem, recte dicitur pertinere ad animam ecclesiae. At simul etiam aliquo modo ad corpus ecclesiae, i.e. ad ipsam visibilem societatem pertinet. Quomodo enim posset actum caritatis erga Deus elicere, nisi in omnibus voluntati Dei obsecundare vellet? Voluntas autem Dei ab eo postulat, ut ecclesiam ingreditur; ergo proposito voluntatis implicito seu *voto,* ut aiunt, pertinet eiusmodi homo ad ecclesiam, et ideo tantum ecclesiam actu non ingreditur, quia praeceptum Dei inculpabiliter ignorat. Ergo actu esse vel fieri membrum ecclesia pro quolibet homine adulto est de necessitate praecepti, voto esse membrum ecclesia pro quolibet homine adulto est de necessitate praecepti, voto esse membrum ecclesiae est de absoluta necessitate medii, qua necessitate nulla ignorantia exusat, quia quivis adultus debet habere voluntatem in omnibus sequendi praecepta divina, saltem quae sub gravi obligant." *Ibid., 278-279.*

Pesch therefore does not expose merely one explanation of this doctrine. He states first that the Church's necessity is only one of precept. It merely signifies that those culpably outside the Church cannot be saved. Secondly, he states that those inculpably ignorant of this precept can be saved by the possession of charity which unites a person to the soul of the Church *in re* and to the body of the church *in voto.*

Nicholas Russo, professor of philosophy at Boston College, published a small work on the true religion in 1886. Chapter fourteen is devoted to "Salvation out of the Church." He first makes the distinction between the body and soul of the Church. Then he explains:

> This mysterious soul is not limited by the bounds of the exterior organization; it can go far beyond; exist even in the midst of schism and heresy unconsciously professed, and bind to Our Lord hearts that are connected by no exterior ties with the visible body of the Church. This union with the soul of the Church is essential to salvation; so essential that without it none can be saved. But the necessity of belonging likewise to the body of the Church, though a real one, may, in certain cases, offer no obstacle to salvation. This happens whenever *invincible ignorance* so shrouds a man's intellectual vision that he ceases to be responsible before God for the light which he does not see.[73]

For Russo then it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church; invincible ignorance excuses from the obligation of belonging to the body.

3. SUMMARY

The Vatican Council gave no definitive statement regarding this doctrine. Some Fathers thought it necessary to demand some attachment to the Church. Both the *in re-in voto* and the body-soul distinction were suggested to explain this attachment. Others of the Fathers thought it sufficient to state that those culpably outside the Church could not be saved.[74] This unresolved difference of opinion was reflected in the writings immediately following the Council. Thus Perriot sees in this doctrine only necessity of precept. The Church is only the ordinary means of salvation. Brugere states only that those inculpably outside the Church are deprived of the special helps to salvation. Marotte, Newman, Jansen, Vincent, Morere, and Russo continue using the body-soul explanation. However Vincent and Jansen add that it is necessary with the necessity of precept to belong to the body of the Church and necessary with the necessity of means to belong to the soul. Newman states that the doctrine is only a general one admitting of exceptions.

---

[73] N. Russo, *The True Religion and its Dogmas* (Boston 1886) 140-141.

However there was a growing tendency among the authors to demand explicitly some attachment to the Church as a necessary requisite for salvation. This attachment was usually expressed as some kind of "belonging or pertaining by desire." There was moreover no uniformity in explaining the nature of this desire; and it was often used in conjunction with other explanations. Still the demand for some attachment of this sort is present in the writings of Leboucher, Palmieri, de Brouwer, Dechamps, Hurter, Mazzella, Chère, the Sulpicians of Clairmont, and Pesch. Leboucher, Palmieri and de Brouwer state simply that the Church is necessary for salvation and that a man must belong to it either *in re* or *in voto*. Palmieri and de Brouwer state that this *votum* may be implicit in the act of charity; Leboucher states that it is contained in the general desire to do all that God requires for our salvation.

Hurter used the *in re-in voto* explanation but the emphasis is upon only the fact that the Church is necessary with the necessity of precept. Mazzella and Chère state that it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church *in re* and the body of the Church *in voto*. Mazzella adds that an extraordinary providence is available for those in good faith. The Sulpicians of Clairmont use this explanation alongside the simple body-soul explanation and the statement that the Church is only the ordinary means of salvation. Furthermore they accentuate the simple body-soul explanation. Pesch placed his accent upon the necessity of precept only. He adds, however, that a man inculpably outside the Church may be saved by sanctifying grace which would unite him to the Church at least in desire.

---

[74] See above, 30-33.

This then is clearly a transitional period. The Bellarminian explanation that a man must belong to the Church either *in re* or *in voto* is found more frequently. The simple body-soul explanation and the emphasis on the fact that the doctrine concerns only those culpably outside the Church is found among fewer authors. However, by far the largest proportion of the theologians use several different approaches, including the *in re-in voto* explanation, thus presenting a not altogether clear exposition.

The concepts concerning the nature, extension and membership of the Church found in the writings of Emile Bougaud are of interest chiefly because of the influence they exert upon later explanations of this doctrine.

CHAPTER III

The End of the Century

1. EXPLANATION OF CARDINAL FRANZELIN

The theological works of the great Cardinal Franzelin exerted a strong influence on the theological milieu of the latter part of the century. Therefore it is necessary to make a close examination of his exposition of the doctrine of the Church's necessity. His most detailed treatment is found in the *Theses de ecclesia Christi,* published posthumously. He had begun this work shortly before his elevation to the Cardinalate in 1876. He was able to work on it only intermittently after that time and it was left unfinished at his death on December 11, 1886. It was published in 1887. It is not therefore a polished tract as it would doubtless have received careful revision by the author. Nevertheless it remains one of the more valuable contributions to the theological literature of the period.

His statement of the thesis is long and rather involved; it is best given in his own words:

> Although as it was said in the previous thesis, some people can be justified and saved without being recognized in the external forum as pertaining to the visible Church, nevertheless: 1. they are not saved except *through the Church,* to whom belongs the word of faith and for whose sake salvific graces are given. They are not saved except *in the Church;* for they are joined not only to the spirit of the Church, but also to its visible elements by means of their will, which *apud Deum pro facto reputatur.* For these visible elements: 2. by divine institution are not merely of necessity of precept but of necessity of means to justification and salvation. Therefore justification in the New Testament is never effected without a relation to the Church and at least a spiritual union of man with these same visible elements; thus before God and the Church triumphant he is not without some union with the Church on earth. 3. However the

> union of some members of this type with the Church and justification without the visible sacraments—derogates nothing from the dogma of the visibility of the Church of Christ.

This thesis can be explained by unfolding its four basic statements. First, people who are saved without pertaining in the external forum to the visible Church are not saved except, "through the Church, to whom belongs the word of faith and for whose sake salvific graces are given."[2] Franzelin insists that as a starting point we must hold that "to be united with and to pertain to the Church is not just *something of a means,* but is an *absolutely necessary means of salvation.*"[3] It is the Church itself which is necessary and this necessity is absolute. It is clear that men may be saved who apparently have no relationship with the Church; in explaining this, Franzelin states the vital point as follows: "The whole conciliation is reduced to this, that from undoubted Catholic doctrine we may explain the bonds and connections with the Church, through which it comes about that those people may be saved who are united with Christ's Church only *ex parte* and *secundum quid;* and these same people by the merciful grace of Christ are saved through the Church and not without considera-

---

[1] "Quamvis modo quo in superiori thesis dictum est, aliqui iustificari et salvari possint, quin in foro externo agnoscantur ad Ecclesiam visibilem pertinere; attamen 1° illi ipsi non salvantur nisi *per Ecclesiam,* cuius est verbum fidei et cuius intuitu dentur gratiae salutiferae, et non salvantur nisi *in Ecclesia,* cuius non solum spiritu sed etiam visibilibus elementis coniunguntur voluntate, quae—apud Deum pro facto reputatur—. Haec enim elementa visibilia 2° ex institutione divina non sunt *de necesitate praecepti* dumtaxat sed de *necessitate medii* ad iustificationem et salutem, quocirca iustificatio in novo Testamento numquam efficitur sine relatione ad illa et spirituali saltem hominis coniunctione cum iisdem elementis visibilibus, atque ita coram Deo et Ecclesia triumphante existit non sine unione cum Ecclesia in terris. Neque vero 3° huiusmodi aliquorum memborum unio cum Ecclesia et—sine visibilibus sacramentis sanctificatio—quidam officit dogmati de visibilitate Ecclesia Christi." J. B. Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia Christi* (Rome 1887) 424.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] ". . . unire ac pertinere ad hanc ecclesiam non solum esse *aliquod medium,* sed esse *medium absolute necessarium* ad salutem." *Ibid.,* 424-425.

tion of their relation to the Church."[4] These people can be saved because they have true faith, gained either *"ex auditu"* or *"secundum gratiam internam illuminations et motionis. . . ."*[5] In the first case the faith comes through hearing, and even when the truth is propounded by a dissident sect, the Church still remains the motive for the faith: "Therefore to all those who conceive the true faith *ex auditu verbi Dei,* the preaching does not come nor is the word proposed as credible and to be believed, except (even though they are unaware of it) in as much as it has been conserved by the true Church. For this proposition of a truth both *credible and to be believed* is not made nor can it be made through sects lapsed and exiled from the Church, that is from the sole divinely constituted custodian and publisher of the truth and from this great and always conspicuous motive of credibility. . . ."[6] If the faith comes about through an internal illuminating grace, then this too, though given outside the Church, leads to the Church; for "every grace which is granted outside the Church has as its more proximate end, conversion to the Church itself."[7]

Thus every process of salvation is accomplished *per Ecclesiam.* Franzelin sums up this first principle:

> Therefore whoever are led to faith and to charity outside the body of the Church, and thus seem capable of being saved outside the Church, really do not come to those supernatural dispositions and consequently to justification and salvation, except *through the word of the Church* as the guardian of the deposit and *through the grace of*

---

[4] "Conciliatio toto eo reducitur, ex et indubia doctrina catholica explicentur vincula et connexiones cum Ecclesia, quibus fiat ut illi ipsi qui tantumodo 'ex parte' et *secundum quid* cum Ecclesia Christi cohaerent, salvi fieri possint, iidemque misericordi gratis Christi per Ecclesiam et non sine intuitu eorum relationis ad Ecclesiam salventur." *Ibid.,* 426.

[5] *Loc. cit.*

[6] "Ad eos igitur, omnes, qui veram fidem 'ex auditu verbi Dei' concipiunt, praedicatio non pervenit, nec eis (ipsis etiam inciis) verbum ut credible ac credendum proponitur, nisi quatenus conservatum est per veram Ecclesiam Christi; minime vero haec propositio *verbi credibilis* et credendi fit aut fieri potest per sectas ab Ecclesia hoc est a sola divinitus constituta custode et praecone veritatis atque a magno illo semper conspicuo motivo credibilitatis lapsas et extorres. . . ." *Ibid.,* 427.

[7] ". . . omnium gratiarum quae extra Ecclesim conceduntur, finis propinquior est conversio ad ipsam Ecclesiam." *Ibid.,* 428.

> *the Church,* not indeed as a dispenser but as the proximate end, for whom and in virtue of whom the graces are granted by God. This is the first and fundamental sense, in which it must be said that absolutely no one is saved except through the Church.[8]

However this principle does not comprise a complete explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation, but must be supplemented by further statements: "This most true sense must nevertheless be supplemented by another consideration, that we may understand the dogma whereby we profess that no one, and hence not even those of whom we have just spoken, are saved *outside the Church.*"[9]

The Church, fashioned after Christ Himself, has an internal and an external element. The purpose of these elements is the sanctification of the world. However these elements do not operate independently of one another: "Just as the body or the visible elements of the Church do not sanctify or save without the spirit, i.e., without the informing elements, divine and invisible, so too the spirit does not accomplish sanctification and salvation without union and relation to the body of the Church. In the necessary mode of this union with the body, and thus in the necessary use of the visible elements, it is necessary to distinguish justification *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis.*"[10] The first mode requires no explanation. The second occurs for example when one cannot receive the sacrament of penance, but makes an act of perfect contrition; the contrition is efficacious not in itself but because it contains within it a *votum sacramenti.* This situation is paralleled by the person outside the Church in relation to baptism and union with the visible Church. He can then be justified if he has the desire to belong to the Church; for then "the perfect disposition *ex opere operantis* toward justification can supply for the actual reception of the sacrament of faith and actual union with the visible Church, so that this union is accomplished in the internal forum and before the Church triumphant, without existing in the external forum before the Church militant."[11]

---

[8] "Quicumque igitur extra corpus Ecclesiae ad fidem et ad charitatem perducuntur, atque ita videntur salvari posse extra Ecclesiam, re ipsa ad supernaturales illas dispositiones et consequenter ad iustificationem et salutem non perveniunt nisi *per verbum Ecclesiae* tamquam custodis depositi et *per gratiam Ecclesiae* non quidem tamquam dispensatricis sed tamquam proximi finis, pro quo et cuius intuitu a Deo gratiae conceduntur. Hic primus sensus et isque fundamentalis, quo dici debet omnino neminem salvari nisi per Ecclesiam." *Loc. cit.*

[9] "Iste sensus verissimus quidem, supplendus tamen est per aliam considerationem ut intelligamus dogma, quo neminem atque adeo neque illos ipsos, de quibus modo diximus, *extra Ecclesiam* salvari profitemur." *Loc. cit.*

[10] "Sciut ergo corpus seu elementa visibilis in Ecclesia nec sanctificant nec salvant sine spiritu h.e. sine informantibus elementis divinis et invisibilibus, ita spiritus non operatur sanctificationem et salutem sine unione et relatione ad corpus Ecclesiae. Verumtamen in modo necessario huius unionis cum corpore, atque adeo in usu necessario elementorum visibilium distingui debet iustificatio *ex opere operato* et ex opere operantis." *Ibid.,* 429.

Of importance to note is that as the justification of the sinner within the Church is not ascribed to the contrition without the *votum sacramenti,* so for one who is outside, "justification is not to be ascribed to the contrition without the desire of baptism and through this of union with the body of the Church, if they are not baptized; and if they are baptized, that same justification is not accomplished without the desire of the sacrament of penance and so by this of reconciliation and reintegration in the visible Church."[12] It is by virtue of this desire that we can say that the person is not saved outside the Church: "Whoever are thus justified and saved, are saved not only *through the Church* for the reason we have stated above; but also (in so far as it is verified in them), in the Church and certainly *not outside the Church.*"[13]

The third statement in the explanation of Franzelin is that the necessity of pertaining to the Church is one of means. In his classification of the necessity of means, he writes: "But there are in the present order certain other necessary means, after the manner of efficient cause, for the acquiring of sanctifying grace and therefore for eternal salvation; [they flow] from a special positive institution of God; of this type is the sacrament of baptism and through this, union with the kingdom of Christ, the Church."[14] The votum, even though implicit, is the cause of the justification of the individual: "God therefore justifies and (in the manner indicated) forms invisibly a member of the Church, not only because of the act of charity *per se et praecise spectatum,* but also because of the will or the desire of baptism, which is included in the act of charity, by accepting the will for the fact of the sacrament instituted by Himself and necessary for the effect of justification and of union with the Church."[15] This votum is included in a person's disposition whenever he has the will of doing all that God requires: "The desire of the sacrament is included in the act of perfect contrition, in as much as there is the general will of fulfilling all the divine commands and using all the means instituted by God as necessary for reconciliation."[16]

---

[11] ". . . perfecta dispositio *ex opere operantis* ad iustificationem potest supplere actu susceptum sacramentum fidei et actualem unionem cum visibili Ecclesia, ita ut haec unio perficiatur in foro interno et coram Ecclesia militante." *Ibid.,* 430.

[12] ". . . justificatio non est adscribenda contritioni sine voto baptismi et per hunc unionis cum corpore Ecclesiae, si non sint baptizati; et si sint baptizati, iustificatio eadem non perficitur sine voto sacramenti poenitentiae atque hoc ipso reconciliationis et reintegrationis in visibili Ecclesiae." *Ibid.,* 431.

[13] "Qui igitur, ita iustificantur et salvantur, non solum per Ecclesiam ratione qua supra diximus, se etiam (quatenus in ipsis est), *in Ecclesia* et certe non extra Ecclesiam salvantur." *Loc. cit.*

The final element in Franzelin's explanation is concerned with the visibility of the Church. Since some people may be saved by an invisible sanctification without the visible sacrament and may be joined to the Church merely by the *votum,* it may be wondered how this can be reconciled with the visibility of the Church. First of all, according to Franzelin, the visibility of the Church consists especially "in the conspicuous teaching authority, ministry and priesthood and consequently in the visible unfolding of authentic doctrine, sacred rule, sacrifice and sacraments."[17] This same visibility is not guaranteed in regard to the membership of the Church, as if it could be certified with the infallible certitude concerning each one distributively, that he truly and before God pertains to the Church or not; since there is no such certitude concerning either the baptismal character of each one, or his internal faith, or his immunity from excommunication.[18]

---

[14] "Sed c) sunt in praesenti ordine media necessaria quaedam alia per modum causae efficientis ad acquirendam gratiam sanctificantem atque idcirco ad salutem aeternam ex speciali positiva Dei institutione, sacramentum nimirum baptismi atque per hunc unio cum regno Christi Ecclesia." *Ibid.,* 432.

[15] "Deus ergo iustificat et (modo explicat) invisibiliter format Ecclesiae membrum non propter solum actum charitatis per se et praecise spectatum, sed simul propter voluntatem seu votum baptismi, quod in actu charitatis includitur, 'reputando voluntatem pro facto' sacramenti a se institui et necessarii ad effectum iustificationis et unionis cum Ecclesia." *Ibid.,* 433.

[16] "Votum sacramenti in actu perfectae charitatis seu contritionis includitur, quatenus generalis est voluntas adimplendi omnia divina praecepta et adhibendi omnia media a Deo instituta ut necessaria ad reconciliationem." *Ibid.,* 434.

It was the Church which Christ promised to preserve; therefore we are sure that the visible society which is the Church will always remain the Body of Christ. However we are not sure that each individual apparently within the Church really pertains to the Church in the sight of God. The visibility of the Church does not suffer from the fact that there are within it some who only outwardly or apparently are members; likewise it does not suffer from the fact that there are some who "are constituted members of this same Church only in the internal forum and before God, and not also in the external forum and before the Church militant."[19]

What then was the sum total of Franzelin's influence in the theology of his day on this question? He stated that salvation comes to each man both *per ecclesiam* and *in ecclesia.* He was insistent that these two explanations of the doctrine were a supplement one to another. The first, namely that salvation comes *per ecclesiam* does not constitute by itself an explanation of the doctrine. This explanation of how salvation comes *per ecclesiam* is valid, and if taken together with the necessary explanation of how it must be effected also in *ecclesia,* perfectly accurate. However if a later author were to concentrate *exclusively* on the fact that all graces are really given through the Church and lead ultimately to the Church, he would obtain a distorted explanation of the doctrine. So while Franzelin insisted that these two explanations must supplement one another, we must recognize that his treatment, if not taken as a unit, could provide a point of departure for an inaccurate view of the Church's necessity.

---

[17] ". . . in conspicuo magisterio, ministerio, sacerdotio, et consequenter in visibili exsertione authenticae doctrinae, sacri regiminis, sacrificii et sacramentorum." *Ibid.,* 436.

[18] "Quoad membra Ecclesiae nequaquam in eo est visibilitas eiusdem, quasi de singulis distibutive certitudine infallibili constare deberet, eos vere et coram Deo pertinere aut non pertinere ad Ecclesiam, quum tali certitudine neque de singulorum charactere baptismali neque de eorum interna fide neque de eorum interna fide neque de immunitate ab excommunicatione constet." *Loc. cit.*

[19] ". . . in foro interno dumtaxat et coram Deo, non etiam in foro externo coram Ecclesia militante membra Ecclesiae eiusdem constituantur." *Ibid.,* 437.

Franzelin was also emphatic in maintaining that the Church was necessary for salvation by necessity of precept and that it was in addition an "absolutely necessary means of salvation."[20] This necessity of means is in the order of efficient causality. He states further that the possession, under certain conditions, of a *votum ecclesiae* would suffice for salvation. He sees this *votum,* by which a person may be united to the Church, as the indispensable element in any process of justification in a person who is not a member of the Church. For Franzelin then, the necessity of the Church is absolute; there are no exceptions. A person simply must be united with it in some way in order to attain salvation. He speaks throughout only of the visible Church, making no distinction between body and soul of the Church.

Franzelin made no distinction between a member of the Church and one who is within the Church merely by desire. For him, if a person were not a member of the Church, he was outside it. Pertaining to the Church by desire amounted to membership, if not in the external forum in the estimation of the *ecclesia militans,* at least in the internal forum in the estimation of God and the *ecclesia triumphans.* He seemed to unite the concept of membership with the concept of the state of grace. This view could lead to a concept of membership which is not altogether visible. In fact there seems to be a certain lack of precision in his remarks concerning the visibility of the Church's membership.

However except for this last-mentioned aspect of the question, Franzelin places the whole question of the Church's necessity upon the solid traditional lines. He views the necessity as an absolute one; his whole treatment is in firm opposition to views such as

---

[20] See above, 59.

Newman's which see the doctrine merely as a general one admitting of exceptions, and to any explanation which pictures the Church as merely an ordinary way of salvation. Franzelin's explanation is also an implicit rejection of the view which sees only a necessity of being united to the soul of the Church; also of the view which holds the necessity of belonging to the body of the Church as one of mere precept. We have seen many of these explanations used by the authors both before and after the Council. Franzelin then represents a marked improvement in both clarity and accuracy over the general tone of the explanations we have encountered to date.

2. AUTHORS FROM FRANZELIN TO DUBLANCHY

Paul Schanz, professor of theology at the University of Tubingen, devotes a lengthy chapter in the third volume of his *Apologie des Christentums* to the explanation of the Church's necessity. Schanz first quotes from the Old Testament to show that the Jews were the Chosen People and that only they shared in the divine blessings. He who would come to God must belong to the Chosen People. When the messianic kingdom replaced the synagogue, there was "no doubt among Christians that salvation is to be found in Christ and in the Christian Church alone."[21] According to St. John's gospel "there are but two armies. In the one the forces marshalled are truth, the love of God, and the observance of God's commandments; and these are ranged on the side of Christ and the Father. On the opposing side—that of Satan—the army is recruited from falsehood, hatred and darkness. The two are in irreconcilable antagonism, and man must choose between them once for all."[22] Schanz concludes that according to the clear and explicit doctrine of Scripture, Christ and His religion are the only means of salvation. This doctrine is clear and certain Catholic teaching. However, to understand it we must make distinctions, as the Church herself does:

---

[21] "Denn darüber herrsch ja, zunächst rein theoretisch gesprochen, unter den Christen kein Zweifel, das nur in Christus, nur in der christlichen Kirche das heil gefunden werden kann." Paul Schanz, *Apologie des Christentums* (2 ed. Freiburg i. Br. 1898) 250.

[22] "Derselbe Apostel bringt die Wahrheit, die Liebe Gottes, die haltung der göttlichen Gebote in so engen Zusammenhang mit Christus und dem Bater, das Wahrheit und Lüge, Licht und Finsternis, Christus und Satan als die unversöhnlichen Gegansäse erscheinen, zwischen welchen ein für allemal gewählt werden mus." *Ibid.*, 251.

> Now the Catholic Church, while maintaining her claim to be the one saving Church, admits a distinction between the objective doctrine and its subjective application, and recognizes an internal connection and necessary relation between the visible and the invisible Church. All in the Catholic Church will not be infallibly saved, nor will all outside it be irretrievably lost . . . the Church is thus following in the wake of the Fathers, who also drew a distinction between culpable and inculpable heresy, between voluntary and malicious, and involuntary and well-intentioned schisms.[23]

Because of this difference in the objective doctrine and its negative application, Pius IX warned men not to indulge in idle speculations as to the fate of those who do not belong to the Catholic Church. They should not pry into God's secret counsels and judgments.

The subjective application of this doctrine requires careful distinction between material and formal heretics and the manner in which the former belong to the Church. For material heretics should be considered as moral or virtual members of the Catholic Church. Schanz's principal explanation of the subjective application of this doctrine is based upon the distinction between the body and the soul of the Church:

> Spiritual gifts are the soul of the Church, while external confession of faith and the use of the sacraments are the body. Those who are inwardly and outwardly joined to the Church belong both to the soul and the body. To the

---

[23] "Die catholische Kirche hält daher ihren Anspruch auf die alleinseligmachende Kirche aufrecht, aber sie anerkennt eine Unterscheidung zwischen der objectiven Lehre und der subjectiven Anwendung, eine innere Beziehung zwischen der sichtbaren und unsichbaren Kirche. Weder werden alle unfehlbar selig, welche in der katholischen Kirche sind, noch gehen alle unrettbar verloren, welche auserhalb der Kirche stehen. . . . Bielmehr folgt sie lediglich dem Borbilde der grosen Kirchenväter, Häresie, zwichen gutgemeintem und böswilligem Schisma zu unterscheiden wusten." *Ibid.*, 274.

> soul, but not to the body, belong people like catechumens and excommunicated persons who, though outside the Church, possess faith and charity, while those merely outwardly connected with the Church belong to the body but not the soul; this last is the lowest grade of membership. Soul and body go together. But while the soul can live without the body, the body without the soul is dead.[24]

In explaining how the soul can live without the body, he states that it is because God's mercy must care for all men even if it require extraordinary means. He has indeed ordained external means and a visible Church as necessary conditions, but He has been pleased, in condescension to human infirmity, to come to man's aid in an extraordinary manner according to the needs of individuals.[25]

In the subjective application of this doctrine then, Schanz sees the necessity of recognizing that God can provide for the souls outside the Church in good faith with extraordinary means. He sees also the necessity of establishing some line of union with the Church for these souls and uses various expressions to describe this union. He states that material heretics are morally members of the Church; they are virtual members of the Church; they belong to the soul of the Church.

In his *Disquisitiones scholasico-dogmaticae,* Valentine Casajoana writes that "Only the Christian religion is true and salvific."[26] In explanation he merely states that those outside the Church in invincible ignorance who do what they can, will be aided by the grace of God.[27] The same year, 1888, saw the appearance of F. Egger's *Enchiridion theologiae dogmaticae generalis.* He phrases the thesis thus: "The Church not only had and has the right of propagating and extending itself among all nations; but further there is incumbent upon all men the duty of entering the Church; the Church therefore is not only a legal society, but also a necessary one, so that outside of it no man can be saved."[28] By necessity he means: "that property by force of which all men who desire to attain eternal salvation, are bound to enter the Church."[29] This necessity is one of both precept and means. The meaning of the axiom "outside the Church no salvation" is explained in two statements: "Before all else therefore: a. the axiom touches those who are outside the Church through their own fault."[30] And finally: "b. Someone can pertain to the Church in a twofold way, actually or in desire."[31]

---

[24] "Als Seele der Kirche galten die geistigen Gaben, als Leib das äusere Bekenntnis und der Gebrauch der Sacramente. Sur Seele und zum Leibe gehören die innerlich und äuserlich mit der Kirche Berbundenen; zur Seele und nicht zum Leibe die jenigen, welche wie die Katechumenen und Excommunicirten auserhalb der Kirche sind, aber Glauben und Liebe bestisen; zum Leibe, aber nicht zur Seele gehören die, welche nur äuserlich der Kirche anhangen. Lesteres Berhältnis gilt als das Minimum der Zugehörigkeit. Leib und Seele gohören zusammen Aber die Seele kann auch ohne den Leib leben, während der Leib ohne die Seele todt ist." *Ibid.,* 279.

[25] "Der Grund der innern Zugehörigkeit, ist in dem Gnadenwillen Gottes für alle Menshen zu suchen, welcher zwar selbst die äusern Mittel und die sichtbare Kirche als nothwendige Bedingung eingesest hat, aber nach seinem Wohlgefallen der menschlichen Schwachheit auch in auserordentlicher Weise zu Hilse kommen kann." *Loc. cit.*

[26] "Sola religio christiana vera et salvifica est." V. Casajoana, *Disquisitiones scholastico-dogmaticae.* 1 *De Fundamentalibus* (Barcelona 1888) 150.

In 1889, P. Anouilh, superior at the Grand Seminary at Pamiers, writes: "Outside the true Church, there can be no salvation."[32] He continues: "When it is said that salvation cannot be obtained outside the Church, it is supposed that there is question of a man who is in voluntary error, either directly or in cause, or in doubt which he does not take sufficient means to dispel. Hence a man who is in a false religion in good faith, in invincible ignorance, can be saved if otherwise he does what he should that he may be saved; for him being outside the Church corporally will not be an obstacle to salvation."[33] He views separation from the Church as a crime[34] and where there is no culpability to the separation, there can be no crime, hence no obstacle to salvation. Thus Anouilh sees principally necessity of precept.

---

[27] See *ibid.,* 151.

[28] "Ecclesia non solum ius habuit ac habet apud omnes gentes se dilatandi et propagandi; sed omnibus insuper homnibus absolutam officium incumbit in Ecclesiam intrandi; Ecclesia ergo societas est non solum legalis, sed etiam necessaria ita ut extra illam nemo salvus fieri possit." Francis Egger, *Enchiridon theologiae dogmaticae generalis* (5 ed., Brixinae 1913) 486.

[29] Hoc nomine exprimitur illa proprietas, vi cuius omnes homines, qui salutem aeternam consequi cupiunt, Ecclesiam ingredi tenentur." *Ibid.,* 485.

[30] "Ante omnia igitur: a. axiom eos tangit, qui ex propria culpa extra Ecclesiam sunt." *Ibid.,* 488.

[31] "Dupliciter aliquis ad Ecclesiam pertinere potest, actu et voto." *Loc. cit.*

[32] "Extra veram Ecclesiam non potest salvari." P. Anouilh, *Tractatus De vera ecclesia Christi juxta Constitutiones Dogmaticas Concilli Oecumenici Vaticani* (Appamiis 1889) 35.

In 1890, J. V. de Groot asks: "Whether the Church is a necessary society."[35] In the *status quesionis* he makes the distinction between necessity of means and necessity of precept and draws two conclusions: "1. It seems absolutely required by necessity of means to be a member of the Church in desire, whether that desire be explicit . . . or implicit. 2. There is a necessity of precept requiring men to pertain to the Church *in re*. For this reason they are *outside the way of salvation* who remain *culpably* in schism, heresy or incredulity, that is all who formally persevere in their error."[36]

Then concluding his introductory remarks, de Groot explains the viewpoint from which he will consider the question. It is clear from the condemnation of Baius (proposition 68) that negative infidelity is not a sin. Furthermore, St. Thomas states (2-2, q. 10, a. 1) that infidels are not damned because of their lack of faith (which may be inculpable) but rather for some sin which they may have on their souls and which cannot be forgiven without faith. For de Groot these two considerations settle a large area of the present question and hence he takes the following viewpoint: ". . . therefore our discussion consists in this, whether it is of necessity for salvation for all to pertain to the Church *in re*, excepting those who labor in invincible ignorance of the true Church. This same point is expressed thus: *"Outside the Church there is no salvation."*[37]

---

[33] "Quando dicitur salutem extra Ecclesiam obtineri non posse, supponitur quod agatur de homine qui est in errore voluntario, vel directe, vel in causa, aut in dubio ad quod rejiciendum non adhibet media sufficientia. Unde homo qui est in religione falsa bona fide, ignorantia invincibili, potest salvari si aliunde faciat quod debet ut salvetur; pro illos esse extra Ecclesiam corporaliter non erit obstaculum salute." *Loc. cit.*

[34] See *loc. cit.*

[35] "Utrum ecclesia sit societas necessaria." F. V. de Groot, *Summa apologetica de ecclesia* (2 ed., Ratisbonae 1892) 119.

[36] "1. Esse membrum ecclesiae in voto videtur ominino requiri necessitate medii sive votum illud explicitum sit . . . sive implicitum. 2. Verum ut homines in re ad ecclesiam pertineant adest praecepti necessitas. Hoc de causa versantur *extra viam salutis,* qui *culpabiliter* in schismate, haersi aut incredulitate permanent, id est, omnes qui *formaliter* in errore suo perseverant." *Loc. cit.*

In another place de Groot states that: "According to the *ordinary* way of divine Providence men are saved only in the communion of the Church; however those who labor in invincible ignorance of the true Church can, according to an *extraordinary way*, be saved by the operating power of grace; however these heretics who err in good faith, are thought to pertain to the Church."[38] In the same year, H. Lambrecht sees the Church as necessary with both the necessity of means and the necessity of precept. This necessity is absolute; unless a man pertains to the Church at least in desire he cannot be saved.[39] Zigliara states in a corollary on the duty of inquiring into the true Church of Christ that union with the Church is necessary for salvation. The reason is the necessity of having some union with the body of Christ. No further elaboration is made.[40]

A. Straub's thesis reads: "The Church is necessary for all men with the necessity of means and for adults with the necessity of precept so that as many as, departing this life, are related to the Church by no bond, are to be judged as having no share in eternal salvation."[41] Straub recognizes the distinction between the body and soul of the Church, but is emphatic in insisting that the doctrine of the Church's necessity demands some union with the body of the Church.[42]

---

[37] ". . . idcirco disceptationem nostram in eo constituimus num pertinere in re ad ecclesiam sit omnibus, exceptis iis, qui invincibili ecclesiae verae ingorantia laborant, de necessitate salutis. Quod idem sic exprimi potest: Extra Ecclesiam non est salus." *Ibid.*, 39.

[38] ". . . secundam viam ordinariam divinae Providentiae non nisi in ecclesiae communione sanctificantur; possunt tamen extraordinaria via, qui invincibili Ecclesiae ignorantia laborant, gratiae operante virtue salvari; quin imo haeretici illi qui bona fide errant, ad ecclesiam pertinere censentur." *Ibid.*, 37-38.

[39] See p. 30. H. Lambrecht, *Demonstratio Catholica seu tractatus de ecclesia* (Ghent 1890).

[40] See p. 433. T. M. Zigliara, *Propaedeutica ad sacram theologiam* (3 ed., Rome 1890).

[41] "Ecclesia omnibus hominibus necessitate medii et, adultis quidem, praecepti ita necessaria est, ut quotquot hinc migrantes nullo ad ecclesiam Christi vinculo referuntur, salutis sempiternae similiter expertes judicandi sint."

Since the Church is an exterior means of salvation, it may be utilized sufficiently if it is possessed merely in desire. This desire may be explicit or implicit.[43] This desire is not something incidental in the process of salvation, but something which is absolutely necessary in all those who are not members of the Church. To appreciate the importance of this view, it is imperative to realize that necessity of means and necessity of precept differ greatly. Precept signifies something commanded and this is always a subjective action; the necessity involved is merely one of not placing any obstacle (namely a new sin) in the way of salvation. Necessity of means is altogether different. It signifies something objective which must be utilized by the person, since that means is a primary one, one which is truly causative of grace and salvation:

> Something necessary by the necessity of exterior means is something *per se* objective which must be made use of by the person for whom it is said to be necessary. The necessity for possessing this means by a certainly serious desire and for seeking it out with a firm resolution, arises from the fact that it is instituted as the only means, if not *simpliciter*, at least primary, for the production of the grace of justification, excluding the presence of culpability. It is also an immediate means which produces grace *per se* or from its proper end, and after the manner of a cause strictly so called, and indeed after the manner of an instrumental cause.[44]

A. Straub, *De ecclesia Christi* (Oeniponte 1912) p. 282. All quotations are from this edition which is identical to the edition which appeared in 1890 in manuscript form.

[42] "At aliquam cum corpore ecclesiae conjunctionem et ipsam pro salute sempiterna necessariam esse hac thesi affirmamus." *Loc. cit.*

[43] See *ibid.*, 283.

[44] "Res vero necessaria necessitate medii exterioris est aliquid per se objectivum ab eo recipiendum, pro quo res illa necessaria dicitur; cujus in desiderio certe serio habendae et in proposito firmo exquirendae necessitas oritur ex eo, quod est instituta tamquam medium unicum, quamvis non

This necessity of course does not rule out the possibility of other internal causes being effective; but these causes are secondary and can be fruitful only in so far as they contain an implicit or explicit reference to the primary exterior means.[45] This then is the necessity of means which Straub predicates of the Church. It is an absolute one. The Church is an objective means of salvation which simply must be used. Thus the *votum* assumes a place of central importance since it is a true use of this means. It is something which establishes a true union with the Church.

> However we have established that this *per se* efficacious means is necessary, not as one out of many means, but as the absolutely only one. In order that it may be profitable for salvation, this means must be pursued, if not in a more perfect way, at least by the indication of a good will to enter the Church and persevere in it until the end of life, or to apply the external means at least in desire; by this a person is joined actually to the visible Church. Hence it is understood that for eternal salvation there is demanded some bond with the body of the Church, known to the Lord God and the court of the blessed.[46]

This *votum* then is viewed as a real utilization of a means of salvation that is absolutely necessary for salvation. That there are no exceptions to this necessity is clear from Straub's remarks concerning those who are in invincible ignorance. Even here he insists upon the necessity of some connection with the Church;

---

simpliciter, saltem primarium, ad gratiam justificationis, exclusa jam praesenti culpa, etiam immediate, per se vel ex fine suo proprio, instar causae strictae dictae, instrumentalis quidam, producendam." *Loc. cit.*

[45] See *ibid.*, 284.

[46] "Nunc autem medium idem per se efficax, non ut unum aliquod ex pluribus, sed absolutum unicum, etiam necessarium esse ponimus ita, ut porteat pro salute consequenda modo si non perfectiore, certe indicato bonae voluntatis ingredi ecclesiam et ad finem vitae in ea perseverare, vel in voto saltem medium externum illud applicare, quo quis actualiter visibili ecclesiae conjungatur. Unde vinculum quidem aliquod cum corpore ecclesiae, Deo Domino et curiae beatorum cognitum, pro salute sempiterna postulari intellegitur." *Loc. cit.*

if such people do not attain that connection before death, it is because of their own sinfulness.[47]

In summing up his treatment of this question, Straub sees only two classes of people attaining salvation; first members of the Church, secondly those who are joined to the Church by desire. Both are said to receive salvation in and through the Church:

> From what has been said, whoever attains eternal salvation after Christ are joined not only to the soul of the Church built by Christ, through sanctifying gifts, but are united at least in some way also to the body of the salvific Church. Although this association can be of various types, the most perfect is that whereby a man is constituted simply a member of the Church. Such a man becomes a partaker of salvation both in the Church to which he is united and through the Church as the instrumental or ministerial cause. The least perfect, yet still sufficient union, is that whereby a man is referred to the body of the Church by no real contract, but only by his will, in the manner explained above. Such a man can be said to be saved in the visible Church, because he lives in it by a desire of his soul; further in another true sense it is affirmed that he obtains salvation through the Church.[48]

He explains this *per Ecclesiam* in the latter case in the same way as Franzelin: all graces come through the Church and lead to the Church.

For Straub then the necessity of the Church is absolute and the *votum,* sufficient in some cases, is a true utilization of this one necessary means.

---

[47] See *ibid.,* 305.

[48] "Ex disputatis quicumque post Christum perpetuam salutem assequantur, non solum animae ecclesiae a Domino constructae per dona sanctificantia conjuncti sunt, sed saltem aliquatenus etiam corpori ecclesiae salutiferae uniuntur. Quae consociatio cum vari esse possit, perfectissima quidem illa est, qua quis simpliciter ecclesiae membrum constituitur; unde homo talis utique et in ecclesia, cui est immixtus, et per ecclesiam, ut causam instrumentalem vel ministerialem, salutis particeps evadit. Imperfectissima, verum sufficiens adhuc junctio ea est, qua quis pacto nulla re, sed sola voluntate ad corpus ecclesiae modo superius exposito refertur; qualis homo ipse salvari in ecclesia visibili dici potest, quod in eadem ex desiderio quidem animi versatur; insuper autem sensu aliquo vero affirmatur ille per ecclesiam salutem obtinere." *Ibid.,* 307-308.

An anonymous *De ecclesia* which appeared in Malines in 1891 expresses the doctrine as one both of necessity of means and necessity of precept. It is explained in two propositions: "The obligation of pertaining really to the body of the Church is imposed only by necessity of divine precept."[49] "For salvation it is required of all by necessity of means that they belong to the soul of the Church, and in the case of adults, to the body at least by desire."[50]

Another anonymous volume which appeared in Paris in 1893 states that a man who is not a member of the Church can be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body; or that he may be saved by belonging to the Church in desire.[51]

G. David in 1893 expresses the doctrine simply: "Outside the Roman Church, no salvation."[52] He explains this statement in three observations: "1. Every man is bound under pain of mortal sin to adhere to the Roman Church."[53] This reflects only the necessity of precept. "2. It is not repugnant that there be found *per accidens* outside the Roman Church, means sufficient for salvation, and salvation itself."[54] This is so because some men are excused from the necessity of adhering to the Church because of invincible ignorance; and there remain available to them means of salvation: faith, hope, charity, etc. "3. Those who live outside the Roman Church in good faith, pertain to its unity in some way."[55] If they are in the state of grace they are in the soul of the Church; even if in mortal sin, they can "by a disposition of mind, that is *in desire*, pertain to the body of the Church."[56] For David, the basic necessity is one of precept.

---

[49] "Obligatio enim pertinendi re ad corpus Ecclesiae imponitur tantum necessitate praecepti divini. . . ." *Demonstratio Catholica seu tractatus de vera ecclesia christi et de regula fidei* (Mechliniae 1891) 148.

[50] "Necessitate enim medii ad salutem requiritur ab omnibus ut ad animam Ecclesiae pertineant et, si agatur de adultis, ad corpus Ecclesiae saltem in voto." *Ibid.,* 149.

[51] See *Exposition de la doctrine chrétienne* (Paris 1893) 351-355.

[52] "Extra Ecclesiam Romanan nulla salus." G. David, *Theologia dogmatica generalis* (Lyon 1893) 1.540.

[53] "1. Omnis homo, sub peccato mortali, tenetur adhaerere Ecclesiae Romanae." *Loc. cit.*

[54] "2. Non repugnat, extra Ecclesiam Romanam, media salutis proxime sufficienta, ac ipsam salutem, per accidens, inveniri." *Ibid.,* 543.

John Marengo, professor at the seminary in Turin, published the third edition of his *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* in 1894. Oddly enough he has no express treatment of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. However in two separate places he gives his understanding of the famous maxim "outside the Church no salvation." It means that no one can be saved if he belongs neither to the soul of the Church, nor to the body of the Church in desire. One of these forms of unity with the Church is necessary for salvation.[57]

Sylvester Hunter treats this doctrine in a chapter entitled "Duty of Membership." He writes: "It is therefore the duty of every man to become a member of the Church, and, being a member, to obey its laws. Just as with all other duties, no man sins by omitting to join himself to the Church if for any reason it is impossible to do so, or if he be ignorant of his duty."[58] He treats the question briefly and then sums up his treatment thus: "What we have been saying is embodied in the short maxim, that outside the Church there is no salvation. All who attain salvation without being visible members of the Church, do so by virtue of an invisible membership."[59] This invisible membership is not further described.

In 1894 also, G. Tepe asserts: "Communion with the Roman Church is necessary for all for salvation, from the institution of Christ."[60] He explains the necessity of means and precept and then affirms: "We are speaking in our proposition of the necessity of divine precept."[61] In a scholium to the question, he introduces the distinction between the body and the soul of the Church, stating that it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church *in re*.[62] Further, anyone who has the desire for baptism pertains to the Church by desire. So he sums up his view: "Since therefore all who *de facto* attain salvation, pertain actually to the soul of the Church, and to the body actually or at least in desire, we rightly say that the Church is necessary for all men, not only with the necessity of precept, but also with the necessity of means."[63]

---

[55] "3. Qui bona fide extra Ecclesiam Romanam degunt, ad ejus unitatem aliqua tenus pertinent." *Ibid.*, 544.

[56] ". . . dispositione mentis, seu *in voto*, pertinere ad Ecclesiae corpus." *Loc. cit.*

[57] See J. Marengo, *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* (3 ed. Turin 1894) 2.251.

[58] S. Hunter; *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology* (N. Y. 1894) 1.253.

[59] *Ibid.*, 255.

[60] "Communio cum Romana Ecclesia est omnibus ex institutione Christi ad salutem necessarius." G. Tepe, *Institutiones theologiae* (Paris 1894) 1.353.

Mendive in 1895 states that a non-member may be saved by pertaining to the Church *in re* or *in voto;* or by pertaining to the soul of the Church *in re*.[64]

3. EDMUND DUBLANCHY

The first doctoral dissertation emanating from the Catholic University of America was written by Edmund Dublanchy in 1895. It is entitled: *De axiomate extra ecclesiam nulla salus.* The work is divided into three sections. The first treats of the universal salvific will of God; the second considers the means of salvation: sanctifying grace, revelation, faith, actual grace, and the sacraments. The third section shows how all these means of salvation can be used effectively only by a person who is subject to the Church. Since the first two sections can be assumed for our present purpose, it will be sufficient to summarize the third division of this dissertation.

After a consideration of the mode of salvation in the Old Testament, Dublanchy turns to the mode of salvation in the New. His treatment comprises three considerations:

---

[61] "Nos loquimur in propositione potissimum de necessitate praecepti divini." *Ibid.*, 354.

[62] See *ibid.*, 360.

[63] "Cum igitur omnes, qui de facto salutem consequantur, ad animam Ecclesiae actu pertineant, ad corpus ejus vero vel actu vel saltem desiderio, merito dicimus, Ecclesiam esse omnibus ad salutem necessariam non solum necessitate praecepti, sed etiam necessitate medii." *Ibid.*, 361.

[64] See J. Mendive, *Institutiones theologiae dogmatico-scholasticae* (Vallisoleti 1895) 1.238.

1. "Concerning the obligation, under the New Testament, of using the means of salvation dependently upon the authority of the Church."[65]
2. "Whether, under the new law, these means of salvation can sometimes be utilized outside of actual union with the Church?"[66]
3. "Whether, in order to attain salvation under the New Testament, there is a strict necessity of pertaining to the Church *in re, vel saltem in voto?*"[67]

The elaboration of each of these points will be examined separately.

1. "Concerning the obligation, under the New Testament, of using the means of salvation dependently upon the authority of the Church." Fundamental to this question is the understanding of the marked difference between the Old Law and the New: "It [new law] differs specifically however from the Mosaic law in this that it has been established not as a particular status of perfection for a particular chosen people, but as a true obligation for the whole human race, so that only physical impossibility or invincible ignorance excuses from it; under either of those conditions, the conditions for salvation *can* be the same as they were under the law of nature."[68]

This difference stems from the fact that Christ entrusted to the Church and to her alone the power to teach and govern. Hence all men must be subject to the Church. This is evident from Mark 16:16. It is also clear in the patristic literature. Since the Church of Christ is the Roman Catholic Church, it is clear that this power given by Christ to His Church now resides in the Roman Catholic Church. In effect then, the means of salvation have been entrusted by Christ to the Roman Catholic Church and all men are subject to her; hence all must use these means of salvation in dependence on her: "Whether it is a matter of faith or of the other means of salvation, the use of the means of salvation should depend absolutely upon the authority of the Catholic Church which, in the New Testament, is the only legitimate authority of Christ."[69] It should be noted here that Dublanchy places all this necessity upon the positive precept of Christ and that he explicitly excuses from this necessity those in invincible ignorance or physical impossibility.

---

[65] "De obligatione media salutis dependenter ab Ecclesiae auctoritate sub Novo Testamento adhibendi." E. Dublanchy, *De axiomate extra ecclesiam nulla salus* (Barri-Ducis 1895) 289.

[66] "Utrum usus mediorum salutis sub nova lege aliquando haberi possit extra actualem Ecclesiae Catholicae adhaesionem." *Ibid.,* 304.

[67] "Utrum, ad obtinendam salutem sub. N.T., stricta adsit necessitas ad Ecclesiam Catholicam pertinendi in re, vel saltem in voto?" *Ibid.,* 364.

[68] "A lege autem mosaica speciatim differt, in eo quod non jam ut quidem status perfectionis pro quodam populo electo, sed ut vera obligatio pro universo genere humano statuta fuerit, ita ut ab hac non excuset nisi physica impossibilitas, vel ignorantia invincibilis, qua existente, conditiones salutis eaedem esse *possunt* ac erant sub lege naturae." *Ibid.,* 289.

2. "Whether, under the new law, these means of salvation can sometimes be utilized outside of actual union with the Church." It is pertinent here, states Dublanchy, to determine whether these means of salvation can be used outside actual adhesion to the Catholic Church. He first considers faith. Certainly those who knowingly reject the authority of the Church cannot have divine faith. But what of those in invincible ignorance? Some Catholic authors (Dublanchy mentions Brownson and Müller) maintain that they also cannot have divine faith. Dublanchy rejects this opinion: "We think there is no foundation upon which this opinion can be based, whether faith is considered in its intimate nature, or in the special condition required for the present dispensation."[70] Dublanchy maintains that it is quite possible for such a person to have divine faith even though the articles of faith had not been proposed to him by the Church.

Since therefore, faith is possible for a person who does not possess actual adherence to the Church, Dublanchy treats at length and in great detail *how* this faith can be attained. In general there are but two means: "a certain traditional authority which is believed to proceed in some way from the Christian revelation, and an intrinsic inspiration of God which supplies for the defect of extrinsic preaching."[71] The former is present in those Christian religions which have retained "fragments of the Christian truth" such as the "divinity of Christ, the inspiration of Sacred Scripture and the redemption of Christ."[72] These "fragments" can lead to a judgment of credibility and ultimately to divine faith. Two conditions must be present to make this judgment of credibility possible: "First it is required that there be invincible ignorance of the authority of the Catholic Church";[73] secondly, "a sufficiency of the signs of a divine revelation and apprehension of the motive of faith. . . ."[74] The act of faith is also possible for members of some non-Christian sects which have retained "fragments of the primitive or mosaic revelation."[75]

---

[69] "Proinde ab auctoritate Ecclesiae Catholicae quae, sub Novo Testamento, sola est legitima Christi auctoritas, omino dependere debet usus mediorum salutis, sive de fide, sive de ceteris mediis salutis agatur." *Ibid.,* 304.

[70] "Arbitramur vero nullum adesse fundamentum quo niti possit haec sententia sive in sua intima natura, sive in speciali conditione pro praesenti statu requisita spectetur fides." *Ibid.,* 307.

In those non-Christian religions where there remain no "fragments" which could provide a basis for the act of faith, there is always present the possibility of internal inspiration of God: "It is possible that this faith can be possessed by individual men through the internal inspiration of God which supplies the defect of external preaching."[76] Thus as a general conclusion, it is true that faith is possible for every individual who happens to be outside actual adhesion to the Catholic Church.

He then considers the other means instituted for the sanctification of souls. He reaches the same conclusion: it is possible to possess them outside actual adherence to the Church: "Those who are *inculpably* outside the Church can, all due conditions being fulfilled, obtain the remission of their sins either through the reception of the sacraments with the due dispositions, or through perfect contrition, together with at least the implicit desire of the

---

[71] ". . . quaedam auctoritas traditionalis, quae ex revelatione christiana aliquo modo procedere creditur, et intrinseca Dei inspiratio quae defectum extrinsecae praedicationis suppleat." *Ibid.,* 312.

[72] ". . . divinitas Christi, inspiratio Scripturae Sacrae, et redemptio Christi." *Ibid.,* 313.

[73] "Primum requiritur ut invincibiliter ignoretur Ecclesiae Catholicae auctoritas. . . ." *Ibid.,* 316.

[74] ". . . sufficiens signorum divinae revelationis et motivi fidei apprehensio. . . ." *Ibid.,* 318.

[75] ". . . primitivae vel mosaicae revelationis fragmenta." *Ibid.,* 318.

[76] "Potest vero, ex interna Dei inspiratione quae defectui praedicationis externae suppleat, haec fides in hominibus individuis haberi." *Ibid.,* 334.

Sacrament."[77] Catholic doctrine teaches that material heretics can receive the effect of the sacraments, since they place no obstacle in the way of grace. Even in Christian sects without baptism "There is not lacking some help, proceeding especially from all those things in prayers or sermons which can lead to the detestation of sin and to reconciliation with Christ."[78] Even in non-Christian sects, "all help is not wanting" since God's grace is denied to no one.[79] The general conclusion is that the means of salvation are available and can be utilized by persons who have no actual union with the Catholic Church.

3. "Whether, in order to attain salvation under the New Testament, there is a strict necessity of pertaining to the Church *in re vel saltem in voto?*" Here Dublanchy distinguishes between those who are members and those who pertain to the Church *in voto*. He is careful to restrict the use of the term member to those who have been baptized, have made a profession of the Catholic faith and who give full submission to the legitimate pastors of the Church.[80] On the other hand catechumens and non-Catholics in good faith pertain to the Church *in voto* because of their dispositions:

> Just as catechumens, by reason of their perfect dispositions can be called members of the Church in desire (just as they are said to have baptism in desire), so too non-Catholics in good faith, also with some reason, can be said to pertain to the Church in desire. For having faith in God the Rewarder, even sometimes in Christ as he is known to them, and indeed prepared to fulfill all that God desires, so that, if the true Church were certainly manifested to them, they would immediately join it, they form that desire of entering the Church which,

---

[77] "Et vero qui *inculpabiliter* extra Ecclesiam versantur, possunt, debitis saltem conditionibus adimpletis, remissionem peccatorum suorum obtinere, vel per sacramenta cum debitis dispositionibus suscepta, vel per contritionem perfectam, cum Sacramenti voto saltem implicito." *Ibid.,* 340.

[78] "Attamen aliquod non deest auxilium, procedens praesertim ex eis omnibus quae, in orationibus et sermonibus, ad detestationem peccati et ad reconciliationem cum Christo conducunt." *Ibid.,* 361.

[79] ". . . non omne tamen deest auxilium. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

[80] See *ibid.,* 370.

> for their part, is possible for them. Therefore they can be said to pertain to it in desire, at least implicit, just as they can be said to have baptism, at least in implicit desire.[81]

However Dublanchy insists that it is only in an improper manner that these people can be called members of the Church. It seems preferable to limit the use of that term to those who actually fulfill the three requirements mentioned above:

> Therefore only improperly are they sometimes called members of the Church in the internal forum and in the judgment of God, or members of the soul of the Church *secundum quid,* and in some way. For in the Church of the New Testament, which, from the institution of Christ is necessarily a visible society, all the members properly so called ought to be visible, bound to one another by visible bonds. Further there is a special reason for avoiding those expressions, because in the present controversy with non-Catholics, the principal aspect of the Church is its visibility. Therefore we think it better and more in harmony with the truth, if it is said that those non-Catholics only pertain to the Church at least in implicit desire. Certainly this is the manner of speaking that is more usual among the best theologians.[82]

---

[81] "Quemadmodum vero catechumeni, ratione suarum perfectarum dispositionum dici possunt membra Ecclesia in voto (sicut et baptismum in voto habere dicuntur), ita Acatholici in bona fide versantes, etiam aliqua ratione, dici possunt ad Ecclesiam pertinere in voto. Etenim fidem habentes in Deum Remuneratorem, imo aliquando in Christum, prout sibi cognitus est, et prorsus parati ad ea omnia adimplenda quae Deus vult, ita ut, si vera Ecclesia eis certo manifestaretur, ei statim adhaererent, totum id desiderium Ecclesiam ingrediendi quod sibi possibile sit pro sua parte efformant; ideoque ad illam, in voto saltem implicito habere dicuntur." *Ibid.,* 371.

[82] "Proinde nonisi improprie aliquando dicuntur membra Ecclesiae in foro interno et in judicio Dei, vel membra animae Ecclesiae secundum quid, et ex aliqua parte; nam, in Ecclesia Novi Testamenti, quae, ex institutione Christi, necessario est societas visibilis, omnia membra proprie dicta debent esse visibilia, visibilique vinculo inter se colligata. Quinimo specialis urget ratio illas expressones vitandi, quia, in praesenti controversia cum Acatholicis, praecipuum caput de Ecclesia est ejus visibilitas. Proinde censemus melius esse, sicut et veritati magis consentaneum, si dicitur illos Acatholicos ad Ecclesiam pertinere tantumodo in voto saltem implicito. Ceterum his est modus loquendi apud optimos Theologis magis consuetus." *Ibid., 372.*

Having made this distinction, Dublanchy sets out to prove the necessity of pertaining to the Catholic Church *in re* or at least *in voto.* The obligation of pertaining *in re* as a member is clear in Mk. 16, 16, in the writings of the Fathers and the statements of the Church. However: "That necessity of pertaining to the true Church, since it is necessary for salvation only from the positive institution of Christ, does not urge absolutely to the act itself except when and to the extent that this act is possible.[83] Again this is clear from the interpretation of Mk. 16, 16 as well as from the writings of the Fathers who state that those invincibly ignorant of the Church do not incur damnation. Also the statements of the magisterium are in the same vein, especially the words of Pius IX in *Singulari quadam.* So this necessity of pertaining to the Church urges only when it is possible of fulfillment; rejection of this union, in order to constitute an obstacle to salvation, must be voluntary and culpable. Dublanchy concludes: "So according to Catholic doctrine, there is indeed a strict necessity of pertaining to the Catholic Church, but this necessity, as it was said concerning the necessity of baptism for adults, must be understood as meaning that, *in re* or *in actu,* this actual adhesion to the true Church is not required when a person is invincibly ignorant of it, or when there is a physical impossibility of entering the Church."[84]

There follows a concluding chapter which gives a threefold explanation of the axiom *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*: historical, theological and apologetic. The historical is a review of the statement of this doctrine by the Church herself and by various Protestant sects; the apologetic is a defense of the axiom against the charges of intolerance and deceit. The theological is a general summation of the theological sense of the axiom. Here Dublanchy states that the necessity spoken of in the axiom is to be understood in the same manner as the necessity spoken of in regard to baptism. For adults[85] a desire, implicit or explicit, of adhering to the Church can be sufficient in two instances: "when there is invincible ignorance of the Church or physical impossibility of entering it by means of baptism. In a like manner, as for baptism, that desire must be accompanied with a twofold disposition: namely faith and contrition."[86] His final word of the subject is:

---

[83] "Illa vero necessitas pertinendi ad veram Ecclesiam, cum, ex sola Dei institutione positiva, sit ad salutem necessaria, non absolute urget ad ipsum actum nisi quando et quatenus hic possibilis est." *Ibid.,* 377.

[84] "Proinde, juxta doctrinam catholicam, adest quidem stricta necessitas pertinendi ad Ecclesiam Catholicam, sed haec necessitas, prout de necessitate baptismi pro adultis superius dictum est, ita intelligenda est, ut in re, seu in actu ipsa actualis adhaesio verae Ecclesiae non requiratur, quando haec invincibiliter ignoratur, vel physica adest impossibilitas eam ingrediendi." *Ibid.,* 378.

> Outside of the two cases, in which the desire of pertaining to the Church, accompanied with the due dispositions, suffices for salvation, it is absolutely required for salvation that a person be an actual member of the Church united to her with the threefold bond of faith, obedience and ecclesiastical communion. Therefore, those who are culpably outside the Church, voluntarily without the reception of baptism, knowingly or pertinaciously rejecting the Catholic faith, or pertinaciously rebellious against the authority of the Church, cannot obtain salvation, if their hearts remain impenitent until death.[87]

Dublanchy attempted to build his explanation upon the solid traditional approach involving the *in re* and *in voto* distinction.

---

[85] Speaking of children, Dublanchy distinguishes between those who live in regions where the gospel has been sufficiently preached and those who live where it has not. The former must receive baptism to be saved; the latter can be saved "per antiqua salutis media, sine baptismi susceptione, ita, et propter eamdem ratione, extra *actualem* Ecclesiae adhaesionem, illi parvuli salvari possunt." See *ibid.,* 386.

[86] ". . . cum Ecclesia invincibiliter ignoratur, vel physica adest impossibilitas eam per baptismum ingrediendi. Similiter etiam, sicut pro baptismo, illud desiderium debet duplex dispositio concomitari, fides scilicet et contritio." *Loc. cit.*

[87] "Praeter illum duplicem casum, in quo desiderium ad Ecclesiam pertinendi, concomitantibus saltem debitis dispositionibus, ad salutem sufficit, omnino requiritur ad obtinendam salutem, ut aliquis sit actuale Ecclesiae membrum, ei unitum triplici vinculo fidei, obedientiae et communionis ecclesiasticae. Proinde ei qui extra Ecclesiam culpabiliter versantur, baptismi susceptionem voluntarie amittentes, vel fidem catholicam scienter et pertinaciter rejicientes, vel contra Ecclesiae auctoritatem pertinaciter rebellantes, salutem obtinere non possunt, si impoenitens cor usque ad mortem gerant." *Ibid.,* 387.

He begins by viewing the necessity involved here as a necessity of actual union or of membership in the Church, this necessity resting upon the positive institution of Christ. The two cases involving invincible ignorance and physical impossibility form exceptions to this general necessity. People in such circumstances can be saved if they pertain to the Church at least by desire.

Such an approach makes it difficult to understand the necessity of the *votum ecclesiae.* If a person is excused from membership by one of the circumstances mentioned above, then he is simply speaking excused from an obligation and nothing in Dublanchy's previous treatment of the question would indicate any further obligation in the matter. In fact he is explicit in stating that it is only *culpable* and *voluntary* rejection of actual union with the Church which forms an obstacle to salvation. Whence then comes this necessity of pertaining to the Church in desire? Dublanchy emphatically claims this as necessary, but its urgency seems obscure.

Thus while Dublanchy insists upon the necessity of pertaining to the Church *in re* or *in voto,* he does not elaborate a concept of the Church's necessity which shows clearly why this *votum* must be present. What is established is the necessity of membership in the Church. But he establishes at the same time the possibility of two conditions which are exceptions to this necessity; logically then the people in whom these two conditions are verified should be freed from any necessity of belonging to the Church. There is no basis left for demanding they pertain to the Church in desire. This seems to have been a fault in methodology. Dublanchy begins with the necessity of actual membership, not with the necessity of the Church itself. It is only this latter necessity which provides the basis for demanding that all men be united to the Church in some way in order to attain salvation. In conclusion then, while Dublanchy advances the traditional *in re-in voto* explanation, there seems to be a serious lacuna in his development stemming from the methodology employed.

4. SUMMARY

Paul Schanz resembled Newman in seeing a difference in the objective doctrine and its subjective application; he appealed to an extraordinary way of salvation. He also saw material heretics as being united to the Church and in trying to describe that union used different terms: they were morally members; they were virtual members; they belonged to the soul of the Church and not to the body.

The largest single group of authors attempted to combine in one explanation the distinction between the body and soul of the Church and pertaining to the Church *in re* or *in voto*. They explained that it is necessary to pertain to the soul *in re* and the body *in voto*. Authors in this group were: de Groot, Tepe, Mendive, Marengo and the writers of the two anonymous De ecclesia's. Anouilh expressed only necessity of precept; David stressed this necessity but in passing spoke of some union with Church in desire. Hunter held for the necessity of membership in the Church; this could be visible or invisible. Casajoana and Zigliara merely mention the necessity; give no explanation. Lambrecht, Straub and Egger explained that the Church was necessary for salvation and that a man must pertain to it *in re* or *in voto*. Egger tends to stress the necessity of precept involved. By far the most forceful explanations were those of Franzelin and Straub. Straub was adamant in claiming that the *votum* was really but another way of truly utilizing the one absolute means of salvation. He shows a dependence on Franzelin in showing how all are saved *in Ecclesia* and *per Ecclesiam*. Dublanchy committed himself definitely to the *in re-in voto* approach, although he did not provide a strong basis for the necessity of the *votum*.

This period then shows a continuation of the move away from the simple body-soul explanation. The authors who now employ that distinction combine it with another explanation, usually the *in re-in voto*. This latter distinction was used very widely, either alone or in combination form. There was definitely a growing preference for this explanation. It was adopted by Dublanchy, who authored the only *ex professo* study of the doctrine. Significantly, he made no mention of the body-soul explanation.

There was a wide use of the term member. Franzelin, as Mazzella before him, spoke of those who are members of the Church in the sight of God. De Groot mentioned members in desire: Hunter spoke of invisible members; Schanz of moral and virtual members. Dublanchy remarked that all these seem to be improper uses of the term; that it would seem preferable to limit the word member to describe those who actually fulfilled the requirements for real membership.

Finally there persisted an occasional mention of extraordinary ways of salvation, especially in de Groot and Schanz.

With the exception of Anouilh, who saw only necessity of precept, all the authors demanded some union with the Church, thus adopting the view of those Fathers of the Vatican Council who thought it insufficient merely to say that those culpably outside the Church could not be saved.[88] Certainly this statement is still found among the authors, but there is always conjoined to it some explanation demanding some union with the Church. It was the manner of expressing that union which was now the issue. There were three broad classes of explanations: some authors combined the *in re-in voto* and body-soul distinctions; others used the *in re-in voto* approach alone; others sought to make some distinction in the concept of membership in the Church.

---

[88] See above, 32.

PART II

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

CHAPTER IV

THE EARLY PART OF THE CENTURY

1. AUTHORS FROM DUBLANCHY TO HUGON

After Edmund Dublanchy's work, there was not another important *ex professo* study of the doctrine of the Church's necessity until the appearance of Edward Hugon's book in 1907. The present section is devoted to the study of the explanations of the doctrine which appeared in the interval between these two major works.

A. Tanquerey's *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae* is certainly one of the more widely diffused manuals of the twentieth century. In the first edition, which appeared in 1896, he explained the doctrine by using both the *in re-in voto* and the *body-soul* distinctions. After explaining the terms necessary of means, of precept, body and soul of the Church, he states: "a) it is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church . . . b) likewise it is necessary with the necessity of *means* to pertain to the body of the Church at least *in desire*. . . . c) It is not necessary with the necessity of *means* to pertain to the body of the Church *in re*."[1] He states that the genuine sense of the axiom is: "Whoever is culpably outside the body of the Roman Church, i.e. who knowing it to be the true Church of Christ, refuses through his own fault to enter it, cannot be saved, since he knowingly and willingly despises a serious divine precept."[2] Tanquerey reduces the doctrine to two statements which reveal the importance he attaches to the presence or absence of culpability: "1. He who culpably remains outside the Church until the end of his life cannot be saved. . . . 2. However he who inculpably remains outside the Church can be saved, provided he pertain to the soul of the Church through faith and charity, or contrition."[3]

---

[1] "Necessarium est necessitate medii ad *animam* Ecclesiae pertinere . . . b) Pariter necessarium est necessitate *medii* ad corpus Ecclesiae pertinere saltem *in voto* . . . c) Non est autem necessarium necessitate *medii* ad corpus Ecclesiae pertinere in re." A. Tanquerey, *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae fundamentalis* (Paris 1896) 472-473.

[2] "Qui culpabiliter extra Ecclesiam usque ad finem vitae manet, i.e. qui sciens eam esse veram Ecclesiam Christi, propria culpa eam ingredi recusat, salvari nequit, quum scienter et volenter grave divinum praeceptum contemnat." *Ibid.*, 473.

Orain, writing in the same year, explains the doctrine in the same three statements as Tanquerey, placing great stress on the fact that it is *voluntary* separation from the Church which excludes a man from salvation.[4] A third author of the same year, Albert Nègre, states that the necessity involved is twofold: "The Church of Christ is necessary for all men for salvation, 1° with the necessity of means, 2° with the necessity of precept."[5] He uses the terminology of necessity of means and precept, *in re, in voto*, but omits all mention of either the body or the soul of the Church and speaks simply of the *ecclesia visibilis*. A man may pertain to this Church sufficiently in desire: "Someone may be united through desire to the visible Church and its apostolic ministry, inasmuch as the external visible means, i.e. aggregation to the body of the Church is supplied by the internal acts of faith and charity."[6] He quotes Franzelin to the effect that this is the type of union that is necessary, not merely some union with the soul of the Church.

De Mandato uses the *in re-in voto* explanation, viewing the *votum* as a true entrance into the Church: ". . . entrance into the body of the Church, that is into the visible society founded by Christ upon Peter and ruled by the Apostolic ministry, is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means either *in re* or *in voto*."[7] In the same year 1897, Castillon writes that it is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church, and necessary merely with the necessity of precept to pertain to the body.[8] Also in 1897 Clino Crosta states that ". . . no one is saved, unless he is in the bosom of the Church *in some way*."[9] In explaining *aliquo modo* he states that a person may be in the Church "*corde solum, sive affective*," or "*corpore sive effectice*."[10] The former is the person who wills at least implicitly to do all God requires of him. This manner of being in the Church suffices for salvation: "We say that no one is saved unless he is in the Church at least in this way, *affective*. The theologians express this thought in this way: that a man may attain salvation, it is necessary that he pertain to the Church either really or by desire."[11] The last author of this year, William Wilmers, states the doctrine in two propositions:

---

[3] "Qui culpabiliter extra Ecclesiam usque ad finem vitae manet salvus fieri nequit. . . . Qui vero inculpabiliter extra Ecclesiam manet, salvus esse potest, dummodo per fidem et caritatem, vel contritionem, ad animam Ecclesiae pertineat." *Ibid.*, 473-475.

[4] See A. Orain, *Cours d'apologetique chrétienne* (Blois 1896) 224.

[5] "Ecclesia Christi necessaria est omnibus homnibus ad salutem, 1° necessitate medii, 2° necessitate praecepti." A. Nègre, *Cursus theologiae dogmaticae* (Mimati 1896) 205.

[6] "Per votum autem aliquis unitur Ecclesiae visibili et ministerio ejus apostolico, quatenus actibus internis fidei et charitatis suppletur medium externum, visible, i.e. aggregatio corpori Ecclesiae." *Ibid.*, 207.

> By a grave divine precept, all are obliged to embrace the true Church and remain in it; hence actual union with the Church is necessary first of all with the necessity of precept. . . . In order for a man to be made partaker of sanctifying grace, it is necessary that he be a member of the Church actually or in desire; no one can be a partaker of the soul of the Church unless he belongs to the body either actually or in desire. Hence some union with the body of the Church also, is necessary with the necessity of means.[12]

---

[7] ". . . ingressum in corpus Ecclesiae idest in societatem visibilem a Christo supra Petrum fundatum quae apostolico regitur ministerio, esse necessarium ad salutem necessitate medii in re vel in voto." P. de Mandato, *Questiones aliquot de vera religionis seu ecclesia Christi credibilitate et natura* (Rome 1896-97) 134.

[8] P. Castillon, *Totius theologiae dogmaticae compendium* (Auch. 1897) 47.

[9] ". . . nemo salvatur, nisi aliquo modo sit de Christianae Ecclesiae gremio." C. Crosta, *Theologia dogmatica* 1 (3 ed., Varese 1932) 195.

[10] *Loc. cit.*

[11] "Dicimus, proinde neminem salvari nisi *isto saltem modo,* seu affective, sit de Ecclesia: quod Theologi, ita definire consueverunt: ut quis salutem consequatur, necesse est quod pertineat ad Ecclesiam vel *re,* vel voto." *Loc. cit.*

[12] "Gravi praecepto divino omnes obligantur, ut veram Ecclesiam amplectantur et in eadem permaneant: unde actualis conjunctio cum Ecclesia

To support his contention that union with the body is necessary for salvation, he appeals to the magisterial evidence: "The absolute and universal necessity of some union with the Church i.e. with the society itself or with the body of the Church, is asserted by the decrees of Councils and the symbols."[13] Since the soul of the Church is sanctifying grace, it is also apparent that such union with the body of the Church must accompany any union with its soul.

In his *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* which appeared in 1898, Louis Billot has left us a similar explanation of the doctrine. He states that the Catholic Church is a Church which is "perennial and indefectible; in it and through it men attain sanctity and salvation; if anyone shall not have pertained to it either really or in desire, he cannot be saved."[14] This necessity of the Church is one of means as well as of precept: "Therefore it is a necessary means of salvation to adhere to and be subject to this visible hierarchy, through the medium of which there is effected subjection to Christ Himself. But this is nothing other than to pertain to the visible Church. Therefore from beginning to end, it is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means to pertain to the visible Church of Christ."[15] In the case of invincible ignorance, this union with the Church may be effected through desire:

> But when we say that it is necessary with the necessity of salvation, to pertain to the visible body of the true

---

imprimis necessaria est necessitate praecepti. . . . Ut homo gratiae sanctificantis fiat particeps, necesse est, ut aut actu aut voto sit de ejusdem corpore: unde aliqua conjunctio cum Ecclesiae corpore necessaria etiam est necessitate medii." W. Wilmers, *De Christi ecclesia* (Ratisbone 1897) 648, 653.

[13] "Conciliorum decretis et symbolis asseritur absoluta et universalis necessitas conjunctionis alicujus cum Ecclesia i.e. cum ipsa societate sive Ecclesia corpore." *Ibid.,* 659.

[14] ". . . perennis scilicet atque indefectibilis, in qua et per quam homines sanctitatem et salutem consequuntur, ad quam denique si quis re vel voto not pertinuerit, salvus esse not poterit." L. Billot, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* 1 (Rome 1898) 108.

[15] "Ergo necessarium medium salutis est, adhaerere et subici huic visibili hierarchiae, mediante qua perficitur subiectio ad Christum ipsum. Sed hoc nihil aliud est quam pertinere ad visibilem Ecclesiam. Ergo a primo ad ultimum pertinere ad visibilem Christi Ecclesiam, necessarium est ad salutem necessitate medii." *Ibid.,* 124.

> Church of Christ, it must be understood in this way: that in those who labor in invincible ignorance of this true religion, the defect of actual union *in re* can be supplied for through a spiritual union *in desire*. Moreover I say that that desire may be included in that preparation of soul and in that will whereby a person wishes to worship God according to the manner that is pleasing and acceptable to Him.[16]

Billot is insistent that in teaching this axiom, he is in no way trying to limit the activity of God's grace, nor seeking to pry into the mysteries of divine activity. He says it is foolish to inquire how God provides for those who have lived and do now live outside the light of His revelation. We know only of the general and common means which have been revealed to us. The remainder is God's secret. The salvation of the infidels is accomplished in God's secret way and we can never ascertain it.[17] Also in 1898, A. Marchini explains the doctrine in two statements: "It is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church really. . . . It is necessary only with the necessity of precept to pertain to the body of the Church really."[18] The first statement is evident since supernatural faith and sanctifying grace are necessary for salvation with the necessity of means and these provide entrance into the soul of the Church. The second is deduced from the doctrine regarding the necessity of baptism. Since baptism is sufficiently possessed if had only in desire, so too the necessity of pertaining to the Church can be fulfilled in desire.

Theologians of the latter part of the nineteenth century became closely interested in the problem of the number to be "saved." During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a rigorist opinion had prevailed, holding that the actual number of souls saved was relatively small.[19] This thesis was the cause of not a few lively controversies. Two of the writers who devoted themselves to this question are of particular interest: A. Castelein and J. Coppin. For in elaborating their view of the main thesis, they spoke of the necessity of the Church in a way which is most significant.

---

[16] "Sed cum dicimus necessarium necessitate salutis, pertinere ad visible corpus verae Ecclesiae Christi, omnino sic intelligendum est, ut in iis qui huius verae religionis invincibili ignorantia laborant, defectus actualis coniunctionis *in re* suppleri possit per spiritualem coniunctionem *in voto;* votum autem dico inclusus in ea animi praeparatione et voluntate qua quis vult colere Deum secundum modum ei placentem eique acceptabilem." *Ibid.,* 126.

[17] See *ibid.,* 128-129.

[18] "Pertinere in re ad animam Ecclesiae necessarium est necessitate medii. . . . Pertinere in re ad corpus Ecclesiae necessarium est tantum necessitate praecepti." A. Marchini, *Summula theologiae dogmaticae* (Mortariae-Viglebani 1898) 48.

A. Castelein contends that the final divine triumph of Christ necessitates a large number of "saved" if the divine victory is not to be a hollow one.[20] In the course of his argumentation he contends we must understand properly the axiom describing the necessity of the Church:

> To comprehend its meaning, it is necessary for us to understand the distinction between the soul of the Church, which constitutes the invisible society of all the souls actually in the state of grace and having a right to salvation, and the body of the Church, which constitutes the visible society of Christians attached to the authority of the Pope.
>
> The formula "outside the Church no salvation" is predicated of the soul and body of the Church, but with diverse import.
>
> Relative to the soul of the Church, it is absolute, universal, exclusive. It is applied to all men without exception. Relative to the body of the Church it effects only those who know sufficiently the institution, the rights and the divine mission of the Catholic Church.
>
> A person can belong to the body of the Church without belonging to its soul.[21]

---

[19] See Hocedez, *op. cit.*, 3.245 ff.

[20] See A. Castelein, *Le rigiorisme, le nombre des élus, et la doctrine du salut.* (Brussels 1898) 299-301.

[21] "Pour atteindre ce sens, il nous faut saiser la distinction entre l'âme de l'Église, que constitue la societé invisible de toutes les âmes actuellement en état de grâce y ayant droit au salut, et le corps de l'Église, que constitue la societé visible des chrétiens, attachés a l'authorité du Pape.

"La formule 'hors de l'Église, pas de salut' se dît de l'âme et du corps de l'Église, mais avec une portée diverse.

"Relativement a l'âme de l'Église, elle est absolue, universelle, exclusive.

Thus Castelein clearly interprets the axiom as viewing union with the soul of the Church as necessity of means; but union with the body of the Church is necessary only with the necessity of precept. Castelein's work was generally accepted with favor and seen as filling a grave need of removing the former rigid view. This is to be understood in reference to his main thesis and not the view regarding the necessity of the Church. However not everyone took such an approving view; one, J. Coppin, undertook to write a refutation of Castelein's thesis.[22] He viewed Castelein's main thesis as contradicting the teaching of the great writers of the Church. Concerning the necessity of the Church, he writes: "Another deadly effect of the book which we are combatting is that of weakening the concept of the Catholic Church and of diminishing the esteem which we should have for the privilege of belonging to it by the true faith."[23] He remarks that one of the greatest modern dangers is "of regarding the faith only as one of the many opinions which can save [men] and the Church as one of the many institutions destined to render the same service for [men]."[24] Coppin claims that this view is given support even by some Catholic authors who "have too often misused the expression 'the soul of the Church,' seemingly teaching or positively teaching that the soul of the Church can be separated from the body of the Church and that it suffices for salvation to be united

---

Elle s'applique à tous les hommes sans exception. Relativement au corps de l'Église elle n'a prise que ceux qui connaissent suffisament l'institution, les droits et la mission divine de l'Église catholique.

"On peut appartenir au corps de l'Église sans appartenir a son âme." *Ibid.*, 212-213. The last sentence of this quotation is possibly misprinted and should read. "A person can belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body." This would be more in keeping with Castelein's reasoning; and it is indeed in this latter sense that Coppin quotes the passage.

[22] P. J. Coppin, *La question de l'Evangile: "Seigneur, y en aura-t-il peu de Sauvés?" ou considerations sur l'écrit du R. P. Castelein, S.J. intitulé: "Le rigorisme et la question du nombre des élus."* (Brussels 1899).

[23] "Un autre êffet funeste du livre que nous combattons c'est d'amoindrer l'idée de l'Église catholique et de diminuer l'éstime que nous devons avoir de la faveur de lui appartenir par la vraie foi." *Ibid.*, 323.

[24] ". . . de ne regarder la foi que comme une des nombreuses opinions qui peuvent les sauver et l'Église comme une des institutions nombreuses destinées à leur rendre le même service." *Ibid.*, 324.

to the soul without being united to the body. . . ."[25] Such writers do not grasp the point that what is necessary for salvation is the Church itself: "This dogmatic formula is absolute, universal, exclusive. But is it a question here only of the soul of the Church, that is to say, the invisible Church? No, it is a question of the visible, Catholic, apostolic, Roman Church."[26] For Catholic doctrine holds that union with the soul is impossible without union with the body of the Church:

> But the teaching of the Church is that in order to attain sanctifying grace, it is necessary to be a member of the Church either in fact or in desire; and that no one can belong to the soul of the Church without becoming part of the body of the Church either in fact or in desire. Thus the infidel, or the dissident must, at least, have a formal desire, either implicit or explicit, of belonging not to the soul of the Church—Jesus Christ has not instituted a soul of the Church—but to the Church which Our Lord has established as the unique means of salvation; this Church is the visible, Catholic, apostolic and Roman Church.[27]

Castelein had used the simple body-soul explanation we have seen so often. It is precisely this explanation which Coppin objects to; it is this which he calls a "deadly effect" of Castelein's writing. It is this explanation which he accuses of "weakening the concept of the Catholic Church and of diminishing the esteem which we should have for the privilege of belonging to it by the true faith." Thus not only is the body-soul explanation not used by an author, but it is condemned expressly as exerting a pernicious effect upon the explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation.

---

[25] ". . . ont trop abusé de cette expression 'l'âme de l'Église,' semblant enseigner ou enseignant positivement que l'âme de l'Église peut être separée du corps de l'Eglise et qu'il suffit pour le salut d'être uni a l'âme sans être au corps. . . ." *Ibid.,* 150.

[26] "Cette formule dogmatique est absolue, universelle, exclusive. Mais s'agit-il ici de l'âme de l'Église seulement, c'est-a-dire d'une Église invisible? Non, il s'agit de l'Église visible, catholique, apostolique, romaine." *Loc. cit.*

[27] "Ainsi l'infidèle ou le dissident doit pour le moins, avoir un désir formel, soit explicite, soit implicite, d'appartenir, non a l'âme de l'Église—Jesus Christ n'a pas institue l'âme de l'Église,—mais a l'Église telle que Nôtre-Seigneur l'a etablie comme moyen unique de salut, et cette Église, c'est l'Église visible, catholique, apostolique et romaine." *Loc. cit.*

Frederick Sala does not treat the necessity of the Church directly. He merely details the ways in which men may belong to the Church. They may belong to the soul of the Church alone; to the body alone; or to both. He adds that all who belong to the soul of the Church belong also to the body, at least by implicit desire.[28] G. Cassanova in 1899 sees chiefly the necessity of precept; there is no mention of the Church as a means of salvation. Concerning those non-Catholics who are in good faith and who do not gravely violate the precepts of the natural law or of their own religion, he writes that they "pertain to the soul of the Church and therefore will be saved."[29] In the last line of his treatment, Cassanova mentions the *in re-in voto* distinction: "Therefore in order to attain salvation, it is enough to pertain in desire to the body of the Church; it is not always required that a man pertain to it in reality."[30]

P. Mannens in 1901 writes this thesis: "The Church of Christ from divine institution is necessary for all men for salvation with the necessity of means and precept; therefore not only those culpably outside the Church cannot be saved, but also those who inculpably do not pertain to it either actually or at least in desire."[31] The Church is then a cause, positively influencing or conferring salvation; without the activity of this cause; there can be no salvation. Thus for Mannens the Church is an absolutely necessary means of salvation; the *votum* is a true use of this means.[32] In the same year, Michael Blanch writes that "The Church is a necessary society, into which all men are bound to be incorporated and to obey. . . ."[33] A man may be saved if he pertain to the body of the Church, at least in desire.[34]

---

[28] See F. Sala, *Institutiones positivo-scholasticae theologiae dogmaticae* 1 (5. ed. Mediolani 1899) 93-96.

[29] ". . . ad animam Ecclesiae pertinent, atque ideo salvabuntur." G. Cassanova, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Rome 1899) 254.

[30] "Igitur ad salvationem consequendam sat est pertinere in voto ad Ecclesiae corpus, non enim semper requiritur ut in re ad illud pertineat homo." *Ibid.*, 255.

[31] "Ecclesia Christi ex divina institutione necessaria est omnibus hominibus ad salutem necessitate medii et praecepti; ideoque salvi esse non possunt non solum illi qui culpabiliter sunt extra Ecclesiam Christi sed etiam illi qui inculpabiliter non pertinent ad eam vel actu vel saltem in voto." P. Mannens, *Theologiae dogmaticae institutiones* (Ruraemundae 1901) 260.

For Poizat, writing in 1902, the doctrine of the Church's necessity does not concern three classes of people: children baptized among heretics, those who are regenerated by baptism of blood or desire, and the dissidents of good faith. Of these people he wrote: "the Church calls them her children."[35] This is because it is possible to distinguish between the body and soul of the Church; many can belong to the soul who do not belong to the body.[36] The only ones who are excluded from salvation by this doctrine are heretics in bad faith and the children who die without baptism.[37] Desers, in a work designed for the instruction of the young, makes use of the body-soul distinction. People outside the Church in good faith can be saved: "It is not because they form part of such a sect that the non-Catholics will be justified; it is because, in virtue of their good faith and their moral sincerity, they form part of what is called 'the soul' of the Church."[38] Bouillat merely refers to the doctrine in passing. He quotes Mgr. Besson and maintains that for salvation it is necessary to belong either to the body or soul of the Church.[39]

---

[32] See *ibid.*, 261.

[33] "Ecclesia est societas necessaria, cui scilicet incorporari et obedire tenentur onmes homines. . . ." M. Blanch, *Theologia generalis* (Barcinone 1901) 346.

[34] See *ibid.*, 354.

[35] ". . . l'Église les appelle ses enfants." A. Poizat, *La religion, le christianisme, l'Église. Ouvrage classique d'apologétique chrétienne.* (Paris 1902) 245.

[36] See *ibid.*, 243.

[37] See *ibid.*, 245.

[38] "Ce n'est donc pas parce qu'ils font partie de telle secte que les non-catholiques seront justifiés, c'est parce que, en vertu de leur bonne foi et de leur sincerité morale, ils font partie de ce qu'on appelle 'l'âme' de l'Église." 1. Desers, *L'Église catholique, instruction d'apologétique* (Paris 1902) 177-178.

[39] See Bouillat, J., *L'Église catholique* (Paris 1902) 13.

Laxenaire in 1903 employs the body-soul distinction, indicating that the soul is wider in extent than the body. Yet basically his explanation is that God is not bound to the ordinary providence He has established. He can act independently. Yet these people who are saved by his independent activity belong to the soul of the Church (which is sanctifying grace) and even to the body of the Church in desire:

> Must we conclude then, that there are elect or saved outside the Church? No, and here is the reason. The normal conditions of salvation are found in the Church to which Jesus Christ gave the two greatest agents of sanctification—integral truth and the sacraments. But after the institution of the Church as before its establishment, God employed other means of salvation: by his direct action which is independent of exterior causes, He can call and sanctify souls of good will. And when by a personal effort they correspond to this interior grace, they are no longer outside the Church; they belong in fact to the soul of the Church since they have sanctifying grace; by desire (*in voto* the theologians say) they belong even to the body, since the good will which we suppose in them contains implicitly the desire of incorporation with the Church, the only society founded by Jesus Christ to lead mankind to their destiny.[40]

Labeyrie, in 1903, states a person may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church; but that it is necessary also that he be joined to the body at least in desire: "An act of perfect charity suffices to lead one into the soul of the Church: nevertheless it always remains necessary that he have the desire, at least implicit, of entering into the body."[41] The third edition of Orazio Mazzella's *Praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae* appeared in 1904. He explains the terms necessity of precept and means, body and soul of the Church; then he makes three statements relative to the doctrine:

---

[40] J. Laxenaire, *Within and Without the Church* (St. Louis 1904) tr. by J. M. Leleu, 22-23.

[41] "Un acte de charité parfaite suffit à introduire dans l'âme de l'Église; cependant il est toujours indispensable d'avoir le désir, au moins implicite, d'entrer dans son corps." C. Labeyrie, *La science de la foi* (La Chapelle-Montligeon 1903) 258.

> 1. It is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church. . . . 2. It is necessary with the necessity of means to pertain at least in desire to the body of the Church; but it is not always necessary with the necessity of means to pertain to the body of the Church *in re*. . . . 3. It is necessary with the necessity of precept to pertain to the body of the Church, so that there is no hope of salvation for those living culpably outside the Church.[42]

Since the first two statements require no explanation, he states that he will be concerned only with the third and it is this necessity alone which is expressed in his thesis.[43] In a final paragraph he states that the Church is only the ordinary means of salvation and that God is free to use extraordinary means: "It is true that God can, by an extraordinary providence, supply faith and the other things necessary for salvation with the necessity of means; but at least the Church is the ordinary means of communicating them."[44]

In 1904, G. Van Noort explains the terms necessity of means and precept. He further divides necessity of means into that which is intrinsic and that which is extrinsic. Intrinsic is that which arises from the very nature of things and it is absolute: "the absence, even inculpable, of a means intrinsically necessary impedes in every case the attainment of the end."[45] Extrinsic necessity of means is that which rises only from the positive institution of God; this is not absolute, but relative or hypothetical necessity. For those impeded from using this means by invincible ignorance, God will, by way of exception, provide other means of salvation. This relative necessity of means really is equivalent to an ordinary means: "*de facto* it has the nature of the *only ordinary means*."[46] What is necessary in this manner admits of legitimate exceptions: "Therefore in the case of relative necessity of means, the end can still be attained without this means, if two conditions are verified: there is an impossibility of using the ordinary means and use is made of another means set aside for such circumstances."[47] After these preliminary definitions, he states the thesis: "Actual union with the Church is necessary for all for salvation with both the necessity of precept and the necessity of relative means so that aggregation to the Church is the only ordinary means of salvation."[48] Only with the aid of this concept of relative necessity of means can the words of Pope Pius IX in *Singulari quadam* be properly understood: "The words of the pontiff cannot be understood of mere necessity of precept. . . . There is asserted a true necessity of means; this is not absolute, however, since an exception is admitted for those who labor in invincible ignorance. And this same exception shows that the words must necessarily be understood concerning actual aggregation to the visible Church."[49]

---

[42] "1. Necessarius esse necessitate medii pertinere ad animam Ecclesiae. . . . 2. Necessarium quidem esse necessitate medii pertinere saltem in voto ad Ecclesiae corpus; sed non esse semper necessarium necessitate medii pertinere in re ad corpus Ecclesiae. . . . 3. Necessarium esse pertinere ad Ecclesiae corpus de necessitate praecepti, ita ut culpabiliter extra Ecclesiam versantibus nulla sit salutis spes." O. Mazzella, *Praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae* (3. ed. Turin 1904) 1.393-394.

[43] ". . . imo, ex Christi institutione, ita omnibus incumbit necessitas ei adhaerendi, ut culpabiliter extra eam versantibus nulla sit spes salutis. Ecclesia itaque societas est . . . ethice necessaria." *Loc. cit.*

[44] "Verum est, Deum posse, extraordinaria providentia, fidem ceteraque ad salutem necessitate medii necessaria suppeditare; at saltem Ecclesia est medium ordinarium ea communicandi." *Ibid.,* 398.

It is evident, continues Van Noort, that the Church is a means of salvation; but the question remains, is it an absolute or a relative one? He has maintained it is relative and he sets out his proof. We must presume here two facts: God wills the salvation of all men and will not condemn a man because of invincible ignorance. He concludes: "If these two statements are true: that the Church is a necessary means of salvation and that nevertheless certain men *per accidens* (because of their ignorance) attain salvation without actual union with the Church, then it follows that the Church is not a means absolutely but only for ordinary circumstances, in other words, the Church is indeed the only way leading *per se* to heaven, but for special circumstances, *per accidens,* access may be gained by another way."[50] In final support of his view, Van Noort quotes in a footnote from the encyclical *Satis cognitum* of Pope Leo XIII: "And it (Church) alone supplies those things which are, according to the ordinary counsels of providence, instruments of salvation."[51] The author takes this as proof of his contention that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation.

---

[45] ". . . absentia, eitam inculpabilis, medii intrinsece necessarii in omni casu impedit assecutionem finis." G. Van Noort, *De ecclesia Christi* (4. ed., Hilversum 1932) 180.

[46] ". . . de facto habet rationem *unici medii ordinarii*." *Loc. cit.*

[47] "Igitur in casu necessitatis medii relativae, finis absque illo medio obtineri adhuc potest, si duo simul concurrunt; impotentia utendi medio ordinario et adhibitio alterius medii pro hujusmodi adjunctis relicti." *Loc. cit.*

[48] "Actualis conjunctio cum ecclesia omnibus ad salutem necessaria est, tum necessitate praecepti, tum necessitate medii relativa, seu ita ut aggregatio ad ecclesiam sit unicum medium ordinarium ad salutem." *Loc. cit.*

[49] "Verba pontificis non possunt intellegi de sola necessitate praecepti. . . . Asseritur ergo vera necessitas medii, non tamen absoluta, quum pro iis, qui invincibili laborant ignorantia, exceptio admittatur. Et eadem exceptio ostendit testum necessario intellegendum esse de aggregatione actuali ad ecclesiam visibilem." *Ibid.,* 181.

At the end of his explanation he places a corollary to the effect that: "Some union with the Church, at least in desire, is absolutely necessary for all for salvation."[52] Concerning the axiom he says: "The axiom is properly understood concerning actual aggregation to the visible Church; the genuine sense is: whoever culpably lives and dies outside the Church, is certainly damned."[53] It is obvious that such a restriction must be placed upon this axiom.

---

[50] "Atqui si duo simul vera sunt: et ecclesiam esse medium necessarium ad salutem et nihilominus quosdam homines per accidens (utpote propter ignorantiam suam) absque actuali conjunctione cum ecclesia salutem adipisci consequens est, ecclesiam esse medium necessarium non absolute, sed pro ordinariis adjunctis tantum, a.v. ecclesiam esse quidem unicam viam per se ad coelum conducentem, sed ita, ut pro specialibus adjunctis per accidens etiam aliunde aditus pateat." *Ibid.,* 182.

[51] "Religionem mortalium generi omni ex parte absolutam solo (ecclesia catholica) praestat, itemque ea, quae ex ordinario providentiae consilio sunt instrumenta salutis, sola suppeditat." Pope Leo XIII in the encyclical *Satis cognitum,* as quoted by G. Van Noort, *op. cit.,* 182.

[52] "Aliqua conjunctio cum ecclesia, saltem in voto, omnibus ad salutem absolute necessaria est." *Ibid.,* 183.

[53] "Axioma proprie intellegendum est de actuali aggregatione ad ecclesiam visibilem: genuinus autem sensus est: qui *sua culpa* extra ecclesiam vivit ac moritur, certo danmatur." *Ibid.,* 184.

In response to the query as to why such a restriction was not made explicit, he offers several explanations: first, because this is already understood, since the statement is a penal one; second, once we have explained that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation, the exception is understood; and finally because in the Scriptures Christ does not make this explicit restriction.

Michelitsch states that the proximate end of the Church is the eternal salvation of men. Since this is true he draws the following conclusion: "If the Church, from the will of Christ is the *ordinary* means whereby men are sanctified, there follow two corollaries of great importance . . . 1. ordinarily outside the Church there is no salvation. 2. all are obliged under pain of eternal damnation to embrace the Church."[54]

But this teaching must be carefully understood. First, the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation; there are other extraordinary ways: "It is a question here of the *ordinary* way to salvation, to which men come through the Church. . . . But outside this ordinary way positively revealed to us, there remain to God an infinite number of extraordinary ways, by which he can save and he will save many who are outside the Church through no fault of their own."[55] Secondly, there is question here only of those who are outside the Church through their own fault. Those who are outside the Church through no fault of their own can be saved, as it were, directly by God Himself.[56] Finally Michelitsch notes that this thesis is directed only against heresy, schism, and indifferentism and not "against men of good will in Christian and non-Christian confessions."[57]

Souben, writing in 1905, states the necessity of the Church and then explains that a heretic of good faith may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church, whereby he becomes "a member of that society which is composed of all men in the state of grace."[58] Such a person also belongs to the body at least in desire, since he must have the will of doing all God requires of him.[59] G. Reinhold sees the Church as the "only ordinary organ, by which men can be saved."[60] For God willed that "according to the ordinary law, grace is communicated to men only through the ministry of the Church."[61] However those in good faith can benefit from an extraordinary Providence: ". . . in such cases God will dispense from the ordinary law and in an extraordinary way will aid the faithful soul seeking Him."[62] Reinhold mentions that such people pertain to the Church in desire; but this is merely a parenthetical expression and he does not refer to it further.

---

[54] "Si autem Ecclesia ex voluntate Christi est medium *ordinarium,* quo homines sanctificantur, sequuntur duo corrollaria maximi momenti. . . . 1. ordinarie extra Ecclesiam non esse salutem. 2. omnes sub poena aeternae damnationis obligari ad Ecclesiam amplectendam." A. Michelitsch, *Elementa apologeticae sive theologiae fundamentalis.* (3. ed., Graz 1925) 277.

[55] "Agitur de via *ordinaria* ad salutem, ad quam homines per Ecclesiam perveniunt. . . . Sed praeter viam ordinariam nobis positive revelatam Deo restant infinitae viae extraordinariae, quibus salvare potest et salvabit multos non propria culpa extra Ecclesiam degentes." *Ibid.,* 278.

[56] See *loc. cit.*

[57] ". . . non autem contra homines bonae voluntatis inter confessiones christianas et non christianas. . . ." *Ibid.,* 279.

In 1905 E. Hugon authored an article entitled, "Le salut des paiens" in the *Revue thomist.* This article is concerned primarily with destroying the calumny that the Church condemns all pagans to hell. In the course of this article he mentions that a man may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church, though not to the body; thus there is no basis for the attacks made upon the Church because of the teaching concerning her necessity for salvation. He states the Church rightly insists upon this doctrine: "But she gives an explanation of this formula which conciliates mercy with justice. She declares that a person can partake of the life of her soul without belonging to her body; and that salvation is possible for all men of good will."[63] We shall see how differently this same author was to explain this doctrine two years later.

---

[58] ". . . et par consequant devenir membre de cette société qui se compose de tous les hommes, en état de grace." J. Souben, *Nouvelle théologie dogmatique* (Paris 1905) 586.

[59] See *loc. cit.*

[60] ". . . ita ut Ecclesia sit unicum organum ordinarium, quo homines possunt salvi fieri. . . ." G. Reinhold, *Praelectione de theologia fundamentalis* (Viennae 1905) 2.149.

[61] "Voluit tamen Deus gratiam hanc secundum legem ordinarium unice per Ecclesiae ministerium hominibus communicari. . . ." *Ibid.,* 150.

[62] ". . . Dei infinita misericordia et justitia in talibus casibus a lege ordinaria dispensabit et modo extraordinario animae fideli quaerenti eum succurret." *Loc. cit.*

[63] "Mais elle donne de cette formule une explication qui concile la misericorde avec la justice, elle declare qu'on peut vivre de son ame sans ap-

De San interprets this doctrine as requiring a person to pertain to the soul of the Church and also the body either *in re* or *in voto*.[64] Ruiz has much the same explanation: "The Church is necessary not only with the necessity of precept, but also with the necessity of means *in re,* if the soul is considered; and *in voto* if the body is considered."[65]

In 1906 Arnold Harris Mathew writes: "Now the further question arises as to how far Catholics are bound to hold that for those outside the Roman Church there is no salvation. Catholics are not bound to believe anything of the kind. The question resolves itself into the other question, how far those who are outside the Roman Church are in good faith or not."[66] According to Mathew this axiom is not of universal application; those in error in good faith are not effected by it. He then quotes at length the explanation of Cardinal Newman, considered above. In 1907 Stummer writes: "The Church instituted by Christ is absolutely necessary to all men for salvation, or, outside the Church there is no salvation."[67] He explains necessity of precept and means; pertaining to the Church *in re* and *in voto.* The necessity of pertaining *in re* is a necessity of precept. Of pertaining *in voto* he writes: "To be a member of the Church by at least implicit desire is an absolute necessity of means, from which necessity no ignorance excuses."[68]

---

partenir à son corps, et que le salute est possible à tous les hommes de bonne volonté." Ed. Hugon, "Le Salut des Paiens," *Revue thomiste,* 1905 (13th year) 381.

[64] See L. de San, *Tractatus de ecclesia et romano pontifice* (Brugis 1906) 69-70.

[65] "Eccl. est necessaria necessitate non solum praecepti sed etiam *medii in re,* si anima eius consideratur, et *in voto,* si corpus respicitur." V. Ruiz, *Theologiae fundamentalis* (Burgos 1906) 320.

[66] Arnold Harris Mathew, *Ecclesia: The Church of Christ* (N. Y. 1906) 148.

[67] "Ecclesia a Christo instituta hominibus ad salutem absolute necessaria est, seu: Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus." A. Stummer, *Manuale theologiae fundamentalis* (Oeniponte 1907) 311.

[68] "Voto saltem implicito esse membrum Ecclesiae est de absoluta necessitate medii, a qua necessitate nulla ignorantia excusat." *Ibid.,* 312.

2. EDOUARD HUGON

Edouard Hugon's *Hors de l'eglise point de salut* which was published in 1907 was a major study of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. Hugon states that it is not his intention to present an explanation different from the one commonly advanced by the theologians, but rather to clarify and to emphasize "the very important distinction between belonging to the interior element which must always be effective, and belonging to the body, which does not always have to be real and can be effected by desire."[69]

In his preface, Hugon reduces the question of the Church's necessity to three statements: "1. The necessity of means of belonging to the soul of the Church, not only by desire, but in reality. . . . 2. The necessity of means of belonging to the body of the Church at least by desire. 3. The necessity of means of belonging really to the body of the Church to the extent that a person knows this obligation and is able to fulfill it."[70] To explain the force of these statements, Hugon divides his treatment into two sections. The first is entitled "Belonging to the soul of the Church." The second, "Belonging to the body of the Church."

Belonging to the Soul of the Church

As there are two natures in Christ so there is a twofold division of the Church:

> The Church also will have to be composed of an internal principle which will give it energy, fecundity, holiness; and an exterior element which will be as the agency and

---

[69] ". . . la distinction si importante entre l'appartenance à l'element interieur qui doit etre toujours effective, et l'appartenance au corps, qui peut n'être pas toujours réelle et se faire par le désir." E. Hugon, *Hors de l'église point de salut.* (3. ed. Paris 1927) xvii. This edition is identical to the first edition which was published in 1907.

[70] "1. Necessité de moyen d'appartenir à l'âme de l'Église, non seulement par le désir, mais en realité. . . . 2. Necessité de moyen d'appartenir au moins par le désir au corps de l'Église. 3. Necessité de moyen d'appartenir réellement au corps de l'Église dans la mesure où l'on connait et où l'on peut remplir ce devoir." *Ibid.,* xv-xvi.

> the manifestation of that life, and will be united to the former in such a way that the two will be only one whole. In Our Lord, the divinity has caught up and anointed the humanity; it anoints it completely; it makes of it its conjoined instrument, so that the actions become theandric, of God and man together. Thus, the supernatural principle, the soul, spreads over and penetrates the body of the Church, rendering it its associate and appropriating its operations to itself.[71]

The soul and the body are then only two aspects of the same reality: the Church. As the actions of Christ were theandric because both natures cooperated to produce them, so the influence of the Church upon individuals, proceeds from both the body and soul of the Church as from one conjoined agent. Since these two aspects are present in the Church, it is necessary for us to define each one precisely.

It is the soul which gives the breath of life to the Church. So in one sense this soul is the Holy Spirit, since he infuses life into the members of the Church. But the Holy Spirit remains an extrinsic agent whereas Hugon is seeking for a soul which will be intrinsic both to the Church and the individual sanctified.[72] He finds such a soul in the complex of grace and charity: "It is the ensemble of these supernatural and created gifts which is the soul of the Church. . . ."[73]

Once the soul of the Church is thus identified, it is clear that there are various degrees of union with it: "Such, in a few words, is the notion of the soul of the Church; actual graces, although they are a preparation, do not by themselves lead us into the interior; faith opens the way for us; but it is sanctifying grace and charity which permit us to live and dwell there."[74] Thus there are two ways of belonging to the soul of the Church: by supernatural faith and by sanctifying grace. Consequently in order to prove the absolute necessity of belonging to the soul of the Church one need prove only the absolute necessity of possessing supernatural faith and sanctifying grace. This is the objective of the first half of Hugon's book.[75]

---

[71] "L'Église devra être composée aussi d'un principe interne qui lui donnera l'énergie, la fecondité, la sainteté, et d'un element extérieur qui sera comme l'organe et la manifestation de la vie, et s'unira au premier de telle mannière que les deux ne soient qu'un tout. En Nôtre-Seigneur, la divinité a saisi et oint l'humanité; elle l'embaume tout entière, en fait son instrument conjoint, en sorte que les actions deviennent théandriques, du Dieu et de l'homme tout ensemble, Ainsi, le principe surnaturel, l'âme, envahit et compenetre le corps de l'Église, le rend son associe et s'en approprie les operations." *Ibid.,* 11.

[72] See *ibid.,* 13.

[73] "C'est l'ensemble de ces dons surnaturels et crées qui est l'âme de l'Église. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

So the conclusion from this rather lengthy first section is that supernatural faith and sanctifying grace are necessary for salvation. Since the possession of faith and grace places a person within the soul of the Church, it follows that it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church in order to be saved.

Belonging to the Body of the Church

Turning to a consideration of the body of the Church, Hugon describes that reality as follows: "Three elements constitute the body of the Church: a visible magisterium and the profession of the same faith by all the believers; a visible ministry and the communion of the faithful in the same worship; a visible government and obedience of all the subjects to the same pastors."[76] Each of these elements is demanded by the nature of the body; since it is the body of the faithful, there must be unity of faith and the profession of the same dogmas; since it is the body of those called to grace, there must be unity of worship and participation in the same sacraments; since it is a social organism, there must be unity of government and of authority. Hugon admits that this concept of the body of the Church includes within it also the concept of a soul different from the soul described above. But he takes pains to distinguish clearly between these two souls:

---

[74] "Telle est, en peu de mots, cette notion de l'âme de l'Église: les grâce actuelles, bien qu'elles soient une preparation, ne nous introduisent pas toutes seules dans cet interieur: la foi nous ouvre l'entrée; mais ce sont la grâce sanctifiante et la charité qui nous permettent d'y habiter et d'y vivre." *Ibid.,* 16.

[75] See *ibid.,* 17.

[76] "Trois elements constituent donc le corps de l'Église: un magistère visible et la profession d'une même foi par tous les croyants: un ministère visible et la communion de tous les fidèles au même culte; un gouvernement visible et l'obéissance de tous les sujects aux mêmes pasteurs." *Ibid.,* 219.

> We see that the notion of the body of the Church, such as we have just analyzed it, includes also the concept of a soul from which proceed movement and activity. But soul is taken here in an altogether different sense from that which we have exposed in our first section. We envisaged then the permanent principle which causes individuals to live with a supernatural life, that is to say, sanctifying grace and its attendants. Here soul signifies the formal element which gives to the Church its existence as a social organism and which impresses upon it the threefold unity already explained; it is not opposed to the body, since the body is not conceived without it.
>
> When we distinguish strictly the soul and body of the Church, we understand by the soul the principle which sanctifies, faith and grace; and by the body the organ animated, the complete exterior society, with all that constitutes it, both the material element and the formal element which renders it vital, active, one in faith, worship and government.[77]

Three conditions must be fulfilled for one to belong to this body. First a person must receive baptism. Then there must be

---

[77] "On voit que la notion du corps de l'Église, telle que nous venons de l'analyser, inclut aussi l'idée d'une âme de laquelle procedent le mouvement et l'activité. Mais l'âme se prend ici dans un sens bien different de celui que nous avons exposé dans notre première partie. Nous envisagions alors le principe permanent qui fait vivre les individus de la vie surnaturelle, c'est-a-dire la grace sanctifiante avec ses annexes. Ici, l'âme designe l'element formel qui donne a l'Église d'être un organisme social et qui lui imprime la triple unité dejà expliqúee; elle n'est pas opposée au corps, puisque le corps ne se conçoit pas sans elle.

"Quand on distingue rigoureusement l'âme et le corps de l'Église, on entend par l'âme le principe qui sanctifie, foi et grâce, et par le corps l'organisme animé, la societé exterieure complète, avec tout ce qui la constitute, soit l'element matériel, soit l'element formel qui la rend vivante, active, une dans la foi, le culte, le gouvernement." *Ibid.*, 220-221.

"the exterior profession of the same faith."[78] Finally, unity of communion. If one has fulfilled these three conditions, he has fulfilled the exigencies of the three elements composing the body of the Church and may be said to belong to the body of the Church. Having established as much, Hugon turns to an explanation of the axiom, "outside the Church no salvation." The entire explanation of this axiom rests in the distinction between belonging to the Church *in re* and *in voto*: "The solution consists in distinguishing real belonging to the Church and belonging in desire. The axiom signifies: no salvation for those who belong to the Church of Christ neither in reality or at heart, *neque reipsa neque desiderio*."[79] While Hugon concedes that the magisterial documents do not employ the distinction between body and soul of the Church in explaining this axiom, he does not hesitate to say that the use of this distinction is necessary in order to gain a precise understanding of the Church's necessity for salvation. Taking into consideration therefore what has been established concerning the body and soul of the Church and the ways of belonging to them, he returns to the statements he made in his preface. The doctrine involved is expressed for Hugon in these statements:

> 1. The necessity of means of belonging to the soul of the Church, not only in desire, but in reality: desire does not suffice; nothing can replace either faith or sanctifying grace, and without them, no justification is possible. . . .
>
> 2. The necessity of means, rigorous, absolute, universal, of belonging at least by desire to the body of the Church; he who lives in the soul by sanctifying grace possesses charity, and this, which is the plenitude of the law, embraces all the precepts and contains at least implicitly the desire of satisfying the obligation imposed by Our Lord of entering into the spiritual and visible society which he has founded. . . .
>
> 3. The necessity of means, not less certain and man-

---

[78] ". . . la profession exterieure d'une même foi." *Ibid.,* 322.

[79] "La solution consiste à distinguer l'appartenance réelle et l'apartenance par le désir. L'axiome signifie donc: pas de salut pour ceux qui n'appartiennent à l'Église du Christ ni en realité ni par le coeur, *neque reipsa neque desiderio." Ibid.,* 303.

> ifest, of belonging in reality to the body of the Church in the measure that one knows and can fulfill this obligation.[80]

3. SUMMARY

This period saw the continued decline in popularity of the simple body-soul explanation. No major theological work advanced this explanation. It was found only among: Castillon, Castelein, Poizat, Desers, Boullat, and in Hugon's article in the *Revue thomiste*. Castillon's work is a compendium of the whole of dogmatic theology, thus schematic. Castelein and Poizat's works were apologetic, as was Hugon's article. Bouillat and Desers wrote books of instruction. Thus it would seem that the theologians discarded this explanation more quickly than the apologists or the catechists.

While this distinction was still popular among the theologians, it was used here predominantly in conjunction with the *in re-in voto* distinction. Theologians advancing an explanation of this general type were: Tanquerey, Orain, Marchini, Sala, Cassanova, Laxenaire, Labeyrie, O. Mazzella, Souben, De San, and Ruiz. There was no uniformity among this group of authors in the actual presentation of the exposition and frequently they introduced additional elements into their treatment, such as mention of extraordinary ways of salvation.

The combining of the body-soul, *in re-in voto* distinctions in presenting an explanation of the Church's necessity was given detailed elaboration by E. Hugon. There are three observations which can be made regarding this methodology:

---

[80] "1. Necessité de moyen d'appartenir a l'âme de l'Église, non seulement par le désir, mais en realité: le voeu ne suffit point: rien ne peut remplace ni la foi ni la grace sanctifiante et sans elles, point de justification possible. 2. Necessité de moyen, rigoureuse, absolue, universelle, d'appartenir, au moins par le désir, au corps de l'Eglise: celui qui habite dans l'âme par la grâce sanctifiante possede la charité, et celle-ci, qui est la plenitude de la loi, embrasse tous les preceptes et contient, au moins implicitement, le voeu de satisfaire à l'obligation imposée par Nôtre-Seigneur d'entrer dans la societé spirituelle et visible qu'il a fondée. 3. Necessité de moyen aussi non moins certaine, manifeste, d'appartenir en realité au corps de l'Église dans la measure ou l'on connait et ou l'on peut remplir ce devoir." *Ibid.,* 304-305.

1. Concerning the very use of the body-soul distinction in explaining the Church's necessity. It is clear from the statement of the doctrine in the magisterial documents that it is the Church itself which is said to be necessary for salvation, and not the body or soul of the Church. Secondly the signification almost universally given to the soul of the Church was sanctifying grace. However Pope Leo XIII in 1897 had explicitly stated that the Holy Spirit was the soul of the Church: "Let it suffice to state that, as Christ is the Head of the Church, so is the Holy Ghost her soul."[81] Thus Hugon's understanding of the soul of the Church is inexact.

2. Concerning the union of the soul and the body of the Church. Pope Leo XIII also insisted that the visible and invisible aspects of the Church must be united one to the other: "The connection and union of both elements is as absolutely necessary to the true Church as the intimate union of the soul and body is to human nature. The Church is not something dead: it is the body of Christ endowed with supernatural life."[82] Hugon does describe the body and soul of the Church as two aspects of one reality. However it would seem logical to expect a person to pertain to both of them in the same way. Otherwise the soul would be more extensive than the body. It would include many who pertain to the body only in desire; as well as some who are members of the Church. Consequently body and soul would not be co-extensive and the two concepts could scarcely be apprehended as aspects of one indivisible reality.

3. Concerning the nature of the *votum Ecclesiae*. The necessity of pertaining to the body of the Church in desire seems to stem merely from the fact that such a desire is always present at least implicitly in a person who possesses sanctifying grace. Thus pertaining to the body of the Church in desire would be a result of justification and salvation, and not a necessary prerequisite. This concept of the *votum* is not the same as that presented by Straub, Mannens, De Mandato and others who see it as a cause of salva-

---

[81] Leo XIII, Encyclical *Divinum illud*. Translation appearing in, *The Great Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII* (N. Y. 1903) 430.

[82] Leo XIII, Encyclical *Satis cognitum*. *Ibid.*, 353.

tion and not as a consequence. Finally there is a possibility of reducing such an explanation to the mere necessity of sanctifying grace. For salvation would come *per animam Ecclesiae* and not *per Ecclesiam.* The necessity of some connection with the body of the Church itself as a prerequisite for salvation is not thereby presented as something urgent.

The *in re-in voto* explanation was used by Nègre, De Mandato, Crosta, Billot, Coppin, Mannens, Blanch, Wilmers and Stummer. These authors seemed set against any use of the body-soul distinction. Some merely made no mention of it, others (Nègre, Wilmers) seemed to discountenance its use explicitly; Coppin rejected it vigorously.

During this period there was increased presentation of the thesis that the Church is the ordinary means of salvation. This formed the basic explanation of Van Noort, Michelistch, Reinhold, Laxenaire, although they mentioned other applications incidentally. But quite clearly for these authors the Church was only the ordinary way of salvation; there were other extraordinary ways. Billot, Orain, and O. Mazzella also make reference to this view. Of particular significance is the statement by Billot that we know only the general and common means of salvation; by implication there are other means of which we have no revelation. This view by such an eminent ecclesiologist must have exerted considerable influence.

CHAPTER V

The Influence of Caperan and Bainvel

1. AUTHORS FROM HUGON TO CAPERAN

Shortly after Hugon's major work in 1907, two other works appeared which are of considerable importance in the history of the explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. The first was *Le problème du salut des infidèles* by Louis Caperan, the second, *Hors de l'église, pas de salut* by J. V. Bainvel. However, between the publication of Hugon's work in 1907 and Caperan's in 1912 and Bainvel's in 1913, there are several volumes which require brief examination.

In 1908, an anonymous *Cours élémentaire de théologie dogmatique* was published in Besancon. It interpreted the doctrine as indicating a necessity of belonging to the soul of the Church: "Certainly no one can be saved unless he belongs, at very least, to the soul of the Church."[1] In regard to the body of the Church, only necessity of precept is mentioned: "But there is a positive precept, as we have seen, which obliges all men to become part of the body of the Church."[2] Schiffini in the same year presents the doctrine of the Church's necessity, stating that those who pertain to the Church only in desire may be saved.[3]

In 1909 three books were published which presented the simple body-soul explanation. A. Moulard and F. Vincent in their *Apologétique chrétienne* state "This maxim does not condemn those who are *involuntarily* outside the body of the Church and who form part of its soul."[4] The soul of the Church is "more extensive than the body and only God knows the limit of it."[5] This is so because the soul of the Church is the invisible society of the just, while the body is the visible society of the faithful. In reference to the body of the Church, there exists only a necessity of precept.[6] In the same year the 11th edition of Lesetre's *La foi catholique* states: "Thus should we understand the rule formulated in these terms: 'Outside the Church no salvation.' Even outside the body of the Church, a person can attain salvation, if he belongs to the soul of the Church, and a person belongs to the soul of the Church if he has received the gift of love of God which justifies and produces supernatural life."[7] The same explanation is found in Labourt's *Cours supérieur d'instruction religieuse.*[8]

---

[1] "Très certainment, nul ne peut être sauvé s'il n'appartient pas, à tous le moins, a l'âme de l'Église." *Cours élémentaire de théolgie dogmatique* (Besancon 1908) 74.

[2] "Mais il y a un precepte positif, nous l'avons vu qui oblige tous les hommes à faire partie du corps de l'Église." *Loc. cit.*

[3] See Schiffini, *De vera religione seu de Christi ecclesia* (Senis 1908) 460.

[4] "Cette maxime ne condamne pas ceux qui sont *involontairement* hors du corps de l'Église, et qui font partie de son âme." A. Moulard & F. Vincent, *Apologétique chrétienne* (Paris 1919) 291.

In 1910 Hugueny writes: "Everyone, who in good faith is ignorant of the obligation of embracing Catholicism, may, nevertheless, belong to the soul of the Church if in his heart he possess that Catholic belief without which no one can be saved."[9] He continues that such a person really has the desire to do all required of him and so: "In desire, and frequently without appearing to be so, he is a child of that Church to which have been entrusted the truths he seeks,—the Catholic Church."[10] Two strictly theological treatises were published in 1911: Ottiger's *Theologia fundamentalis* and Van Laak's *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis.* Ottiger describes the Church as the ordinary means of salvation: ". . . the Church of Christ is the only, ordinary and therefore necessary way of salvation, so that whoever through his own grave fault is not united with it and who dies without being freed from this guilt, cannot be saved."[11] In the course of his treatment he explains the meaning of necessity of means and precept; he requires an explicit desire of those who know of the Church but are prevented from entering; he requires an implicit desire of all men who are inculpably ignorant. Van Laak sees the necessity as one of means: "Union with the body of the Church is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means."[12] This may be fulfilled either *in re* or *in voto*: "It is not absolutely necessary to pertain to the Church *in re*. It is necessary to pertain to the Church in desire."[13] Prevel in 1912 mentions that the necessity of pertaining to the body of the Church is only one of precept: "The necessity, which we maintain for adults, is not of means but precept, and therefore he who is inculpably outside the body of the Church can be saved provided he fulfill the other conditions necessary for salvation."[14] This statement is based on a misinterpretation of Pius IX. The necessity of pertaining to the soul of the Church is absolute: "It is absolutely necessary for the attainment of salvation that a man pertain perfectly to the soul of the Church."[15] He also mentions in passing that a man may belong to the body of the Church either *in re* or *in voto;* an implicit *votum* will suffice in certain cases. Naulerts in a treatise which shows considerable dependence on the anonymous text which appeared in Malines in 1891[16] adopts the explanation of

---

[5] "L'âme de l'Église est plus entendue que son corps et Dieu seul en connait la limite." *Loc. cit.*

[6] See *loc. cit.*

[7] "Ainsi doit être comprise la règle formulée en ces termes: 'Hors de l'Église point de salut.' Même hors du corps de l'Église, on peut arriver au salut, si l'on appartient à l'âme de l'Église, et l'on appartient à l'âme de l'Église si l'on a reçu le don d'amour de Dieu qui justifie et produit la vie surnaturelle." H. Lesetre, *La foi catholique* (Paris 11 ed. 1909) 235.

[8] See J. Labourt, *Cours supérieur d'instruction religieuse* (Paris 3 ed. 1909) 243.

[9] E. Hugueny, *Catholicism and Criticism,* trans. S. M. Hogan (London 1922) 171.

[10] *Ibid.,* 172.

---

[11] ". . . Christi Ecclesiam esse unicam, ordinariam atque adeo necessariam salutis viam, ut qui gravi sua culpa cum ea coniunctus non sit et hac culpa non liberatus moriatur, salvus fieri non possit." I. Ottiger, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Freiburg 1911) 261.

[12] "Coniunctio cum corpore ecclesiae necessaria est ad salutem necessitate medii." H. Van Laak, *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* (Prati 1911) 1.197.

[13] "Non absolute necessarium est, ad ecclesiam pertinere re. Necesse est pertinere ad ecclesiam voto." *Ibid.,* 200.

[14] "Necessitas, quam pro adultis propugnamus, non est media, sed praecepti, et ideo qui inculpabiliter extra corpus Ecclesiae exsistit, salvari potest, modo alias conditiones ad salutem necessarias adimpleat." P. B. Prevel, *Theologiae dogmaticae elementa* (Paris 1912) 1.190.

[15] "Ad aeternam salutem consequandam, absolute necessarium est, ut homo ad animam Ecclesiae perfecte pertineat." *Ibid.,* 194.

[16] See above, 75.

E. Hugon. It is necessary to pertain to the soul of the Church *in re* and the body *in voto* in order to attain salvation.[17]

2. LOUIS CAPERAN

Caperan's monumental work first appeared in 1912. It is entitled *Le problème du salut des infidèles* and is in two volumes; the first *Essai historique,* the second *Essai théologique.* The object of Caperan's study, the salvation of infidels, is certainly closely related to the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation, though it should be evident that his study is much broader. Caperan's study has given direction to the twentieth century investigation of this problem. It has become a classic source not only for the question of the salvation of infidels but also for closely allied subjects, concerning which Caperan makes pertinent reflections.[18] Thus it has exerted certainly a strong influence upon the theologians in regard to the doctrine of the Church's necessity. Here attention will be directed to the second volume, *Essai théologique.*

In a chapter entitled *Les moyens extraordinaires de salut,* the author considers the means of salvation which are available to men. It is most important to understand his approach to the question. He sees the necessity of the Church as the unquestioned traditional doctrine: ". . . in order to participate effectively in the merits of Christ, it is necessary to become incorporated into the Church."[19] However it is not true that outside the Church there is no grace; this was the teaching of Quesnel and it was condemned. Thus it is certain that grace is given to all and places salvation within the reach of all men. This for Caperan establishes the dilemma which is the starting point for his investigation of the means of salvation: all men can possess grace and yet all men must belong to the Church. In Caperan's own words: "It follows from a comparison of these two formulas that the knowledge of the Church is not the only possible way of attaining faith and heaven, and nevertheless union with the Church is an absolutely indispensable condition for salvation."[20]

---

[17] See J. Naulaerts, *De ecclesia Christi* (Mechliniae 1913) 60-61.

[18] A study comparable to Caperan's did not appear until 1939 (R. Lombardi, *La salvezza di chi non ha fede* (Rome 1939).

[19] ". . . pour participer efficacement aux mérites du Christ, il faut donc s'agréger a l'Eglise." L. Caperan, *Le problème du salut des infidèles* (Toulouse 1912) 80.

This then is the perspective in which Caperan views the question of extraordinary means of salvation. Union with the Church is absolutely necessary for salvation; but grace is available to all men and thus salvation also; so the Church must not be the only way of arriving at faith and grace, the necessities of salvation. Both these statements are true; Caperan's object here is to reconcile them, to synthesize them by giving precision to the notion of extraordinary means of salvation. Without this understanding of Caperan's perspective, it will be impossible to understand his treatment.

Having established the *status questionis,* Caperan turns first to the axiom "outside the Church no salvation." He says: "As no one can go to the Father except by going through the Son, so no one can be united to Christ except in the Church and by the Church."[21] This doctrine immediately poses the problem of how people who have no knowledge of the Church are saved. To be consistent it is necessary to show how these people, if they attain salvation, truly belong to the Church. He rejects the explanation which states that men may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church: "The formula is unfortunate in as much as it leads to the thought that these just persons form a sort of invisible Church, separated from the other and that there would be no question for them of aggregation to the visible society established by Our Lord."[22] He insists that it is the Church that is necessary and that supernatural life can be possessed only by becoming a member of the Church:

---

[20] "Il résult du rapprochement des deux formules que la connaissance de l'Eglise n'est pas la seule voie possible pour arriver à la foi at au ciel, et que, cependant, l'appartenance à l'Église est une condition indispensable de salut." *Loc cit.*

[21] "Comme nul ne peut aller au Père qu'en passant par le Fils, nul desormais ne peut s'unir au Christ que dans l'Église et par l'Église." *Loc. cit.*

[22] "La formule est malheureuse dans la mesure où elle conduirait à penser que ces justes forment une sorte d'Église invisible, dedoublement de l'autre, et qu'il ne saurait être question pour eux d'aggrégation à la société visible établie par Notre-Seigneur." *Ibid.,* 81-82.

> Without any doubt, the action of grace is not halted at the frontiers of Catholicism; its light extends to all places, as far as there is a soul to save. But in the present economy, all grace is given in consideration of the Church, becomes a force which attracts to the Church, culminates in uniting to the Church by the tie of implicit faith all souls of good faith. Supernatural life can be possessed only by becoming a member of the Church. In a word, by divine will, union with the body of the Church is an indispensable means of salvation.[23]

Thus in order to maintain the traditional teaching upon the subject:

> It is necessary to say that men of good will belong at heart to the visible Church. When, by reason of an invincible ignorance, incorporation into the Catholic society is not realized in fact, even the implicit desire of forming part of it supplies[24] effective incorporation. The favorable dispositions of a conscience which does not know, which cannot know, takes the place of the impossible exterior course. Is not the particular willing of this course really included in the general design of honoring and serving God as he wishes to be honored and served? In this sense, the visible Church possesses very many more members that it numbers baptized, and it is *à propos* of these unknown members—not in regard to

---

[23] "Sans aucun doute, l'action de la grâce ne s'arrête pas aux frontières du Catholicisme; son rayonnement s'étend de toutes parts, aussi loin qu'il y a un âme à sauver. Mais, dans l'economie présente, toute grace est donnée en considération de l'Église, devient une force attractive vers l'Église, arrive a unir à l'Église par le lien de la foi implicite toutes les âmes de bonne foi. On ne possède en soi la vie surnaturelle qu'en étant membre de l'Église. En un mot, de par la volonté divine, l'appartenance au corps de l'Église est un moyen de salut indispensable." *Ibid.,* 82.

[24] In accordance with the observation of Msgr. d'Herbigny, Caperan added the phrase "pour l'essential" here in the 1934 edition in order to distinguish this incorporation into the Church from the status of membership. The former gives no juridic status nor a right to the sacraments. See *loc. cit.*

> the Church herself—that the distinction between body and soul comes naturally to mind; they are not present bodily in the Catholic communion, but they are there at heart and by their will.[25]

Having effected this clear exposition, Caperan turns to the *Existence et notion précise des moyens extraordinaires de salut.* Again it is most important to understand Caperan's perspective:

> Pagans could be saved, before the Gospel, without belonging in the least to the Jewish society; after the Gospel, without belonging *exteriorly* to the Catholic Church. It follows that neither the Mosaic revelation nor the Christian revelation are indispensable means, so that sufficient supernatural truth can come, in some way, to the pagans. That is a very serious concession. Is this not to call in doubt the necessity of public revelation? Is this not to diminish wrongly the prerogatives of the Church, which alone has received the mission of showing to men the true faith and life eternal?[26]

---

[25] "Il faut dire que les hommes de bonne volonté appartiennent *de coeur* a l'Eglise visible. Lorsque, en raison d'une ignorance invincible, l'incorporation dans la société catholique ne se réalise pas en fait, le désir même implicite d'en faire partie supplée à l'incorporation effective. Les dispositions favorables d'une conscience qui ne sait pas, qui ne peut savoir, tiennent lieu de la démarche exterieure impossible. Le vouloir particulier de cette démarche n'est-il pas réellement inclus dans le dessein général d'honorer et de servir Dieu, comme il veut être honoré et servi? En ce sens, l'Église visible possède beaucoup plus de membres qu'elle ne compte de baptisés, et c'est à propos de ces membres inconnus—non eu egard a l'Église même—que la distinction entre le corps et l'âme vient naturellement à l'esprit; ils ne sont pas presents *de corps* dans la communion catholique, mais ils y sont *de coeur* et *de volonté.*" *Ibid.,* p. 82.

[26] "Les paiens ont pu se sauver, avant l'Evangile, sans appartenir le moins du monde à la société israélite; après l'Evangile, sans appartenir *extérieurement* à l'Église catholique. Il s'ensuit que ni la révélation mosaïque, ni la révélation chrétienne ne sont des moyens indispensables, pour que la vérité surnaturelle suffisante puisse, de quelque manière, parvenir aux païens. Concession très grave que celle-là. N'est-ce pas révoquer en doute la nécessité de la révélation publique? N'est-ce pas diminuer injurieusement les prérogatives de l'Église, qui seule a reçu mission de montrer aux hommes la vraie foi et la vie éternelle." *Ibid.,* 83.

For we must hold for extraordinary means which benefit a great number of pagans; or else admit that great numbers of them live and die without any hope of salvation. Again the same dilemma is met; we must hold for the existence of extraordinary means of salvation; but these means seem to militate against the unquestioned absolute necessity of the Church.

In the face of such a dilemma we can consider two aspects. The first is the good obtained de facto by these extraordinary means. Here we are helpless; this is God's secret and we can not penetrate it. Secondly we can examine the very right to existence of these means and understand their existence as doing no harm to the prerogatives of the Church: "On the other hand, is it a matter of admitting the certain existence, by right, of extraordinary means, whose field of action, as large as it may be, and whose success, as considerable as it may become, leaves intact the necessity of a revelation publicly taught, does no harm to the extension or to the rights of the Church, removes nothing from the urgent necessity of the missions? We do not hesitate to affirm this truth."[27] This second consideration then is the one with which the author concerns himself.

The conduct of Providence toward individuals is altogether different than the general government of the human race. We cannot know what passes between an individual soul and God, but we can know the fact that God acts upon individuals: "Nevertheless it is very much to know that besides the general means of salvation which revelation uncovers to us, there are others, of which Providence keeps the secret and which It knows how to apply to each man in particular. We dare to say that, in the providential plan, this appendage of extraordinary means in favor of individuals is a provisory, but necessary, complement of the dispositions taken with regard to the whole of humanity."[28]

---

[27] "En revanche, s'agit-il d'admettre *en droit* l'existence certaine de moyens extraordinaires, dont le champ d'action, si large qu'il puisse être, et le succès, si considérable qu'il devienne, laissent subsister la nécessité d'un révélation publiquement enseignée, ne nuisent pas à l'extension ni aux droits de l'Église, ne sauraient rien enlever à l'urgente nécessité des missions? Nous n'hesitons pas à affirmer cette verité." *Ibid.,* 84.

[28] "Neanmoins, c'est beaucoup de savoir qu'à côte des moyens de salut généraux que la révélation nous découvre, il y en a d'autres, dont la

God wishes the salvation of all men and to effect that salvation he has established the Church; but this providential plan can not possibly be an obstacle to the salvation of those who are in invincible ignorance of the Church. Otherwise the establishment of the Church would be a negation of the primary divine plan: the salvation of all men. Certainly we must hold that God is not bound to His institutions and that His salvific powers are not circumscribed by the limits of the ordinary economy He has established:

> Since God is not a prisoner of the salutary institutions which He has established for the generality of men, He will see to it that no soul, capable of being saved but unable to profit from advantages of which it is ignorant, finds itself unjustly sacrificed solely because of historical necessities or geographic difficulties. Special dispositions of Providence supply, for the individual, those things which at the time the general plan of salvation does not offer them.[29]

These special dispositions of Providence are called extraordinary means of salvation; they are not extraordinary in the sense of rare or miraculous, but rather extraordinary in the sense of extra-normal. The normal means of salvation have been the human ministries established by God: the primitive family, the Jewish nation and finally the Church. It is in contrast with these normal means that we can understand the nature of the extraordinary ones. Thus Caperan pictures the human race as provided for by a general plan of salvation. Due to the malice of men, this plan

---

Providence a le secret et qu'elle sait appliquer à chaque homme en particulier. Nous oserions dire que, dans le plan providentiel, cette annexe de moyens extraordinaires en faveur des individus est un complément provisoire, mais nécessaire, des dispositions prises à l'egard de l'humanité entière." *Ibid.,* 85.

[29] "Puisque Dieu n'est pas le prisonnier des institutions salutaires, qu'il a solennellement établies pour la généralité des hommes, il saura faire qu'aucune âme humaine capable de se sauver, mais ne pouvant profiter d'avantages qu'elle ignore, ne se trouve, du seul fait des nécessités historiques ou des difficultés géographiques, injustement sacrifiée. Des dispositions spéciales de la Providence suppléent, pour les individus, à ce que ne leur offre pas, dans le moment, l'économie du plan général du salut." *Ibid.,* 86.

has not reached out to all men; it does not now actually bring salvation to all men. These are special dispositions of Providence deprived of salvation; for God has resources beyond His own ordinances and He has means which supply for what is lacking in the general plan, thus bringing salvation or the possibility of salvation to all; but on that account these men are not unjustly which provide for individuals only; there still remains only one general official plan of salvation for the human race. Caperan explains at length the relation of these means to the ordinary means:

> We understand . . . by *extraordinary way* of salvation the ensemble of special proceedings which, while falling outside the framework of the general providential economy, are not at odds with it. We have here an exception to the general rule, but not a conflict. We are in the presence of an order of secondary dispositions which are applied quite regularly whenever the means officially established are lacking. It is not that these latter means were in themselves insufficient: if the concurrence of secondary causes had not deserted the divine work, if the primitive revelation had not been altered so much by polytheism; certainly, the Christian revelation was organized in such a way, that today the entire world would have been won for the Gospel. It remains true, moreover, that outside of the Catholic Church, there is not in the world any other religious organization which, as such, can be of service for the salvation of men. But God remains free to come to the aid of individuals in invincible ignorance, even though He does it without exterior teaching. The useful value of the ordinary means is not diminished by this, and the rights of the Church remain unharmed. In brief, the extraordinary means of salvation do not act in concurrence with and never form a useless repetition of the ordinary means; they have only a supplementary role. If it is true that this role is by nature provisional and tends to disappear more and more before the progress of the Church, it is, meanwhile, so important that it is demanded by the infinite goodness of God and the superabundant merits of the Saviour. In those countries which do not enter into the sphere of action of the ordinary means, there is nothing preventing God from having his own methods, not miraculous, but hidden, less easy than the ordinary means, but not

> rarely employed or ineffective, of bringing to the faith and to salvation pagans of good will.[30]

There are then extraordinary means of salvation; their existence cannot be doubted. Revelation has not told us in particular what these means are; yet Caperan insists that even when they are operative, salvation still comes *in ecclesia* and *per ecclesiam*:

> What are these extraordinary means of salvation? Revelation has not told us. The Church has received the order, the power, and the exclusive right of leading souls to Jesus Christ; she is the treasurer of the redemptive grace which she dispenses with abundance by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the sacraments. She does not know how the superabundance of her riches is granted—extrasacramentally—to the number of children which she has among the infidels and who, although they are not

---

[30] "On entend . . . par *voie extraordinaire* de salut l'ensemble des procédés spéciaux qui, tout en sortant du cadre de l'économie providentielle générale, ne lui portent aucunement atteinte. Il y a là une exception à la règle commune, mais non pas un désordre. Nous sommes en présence d'un ordre de dispositions secondaires, qui s'appliquent tout à fait régulièrement, chaque fois que les moyens officiellement établis font défaut. Ce n'est pas que ces derniers moyens fussent en eux-mêmes insuffisants: si le concours des causes secondes ne s'etait pas dérobé à l'oeuvre divine, la révélation primitive n'eût pas été alterée si tôt par le polythéisme; surtout, la révélation chrétienne est organisée de telle sorte qu'aujourd'hui la terre entière devrait être conquise à l'Evangile. Il demeure vrai, par ailleurs, qu'en dehors de l'Eglise catholique, il n'y a pas au monde une autre organisation religieuse qui puisse, comme telle, servir au salut des hommes. Mais Dieu reste libre de subvenir quand même, sans enseignement extérieur, à l'ignorance invincible des individus. La valeur utile des moyens ordinaires n'en est pas diminuée, et les droits de l'Eglise restent saufs. Bref, les moyens extraordinaires de salut n'agissent pas en concurrence et ne font jamais double emploi avec les moyens ordinaires; ils n'ont qu'un rôle de suppleance. S'il est vrai que ce rôle est de sa nature intérimaire et de fait tend à s'éclipser de plus en plus devant les progrès de l'Eglise, il est, en attendant, aussi considérable que l'exigent la bonté infinie de Dieu et les mérites surabondants du Sauveur. Dans les pays qui ne rentrent pas dans l'orbite d'action des moyens ordinaires, rien n'empêche que Dieu n'ait ses procédés à lui, nullement miraculeux, mais cachés, moins faciles que les moyens ordinaires, mais non pas rarement employés ni inefficaces, afin d'amener à la foi et au salut le païen de bonne volonté." *Ibid.*, 88-89.

> reached by her preaching, are saved nevertheless because of her, by her and in her. What is certain is that none among them can invisibly form part of her visible body, without having supernatural life, without an act of love of God or of perfect contrition, and this act of charity supposes at least the knowledge of God and of supernatural Providence.[31]

By what means does this minimum knowledge of the necessary truths come to these pagans? Caperan replies that an adequate answer will always escape us but that we can arrange in "satisfying hypotheses" the elements of a solution which are known to us. First there are the remains of truth conserved in false religions. Certainly there are elements of truth in false religions, especially in Judaism and Mohammedanism; but these religions are not in virtue of these truths means of salvation:

> Certainly we are not going to attribute to Judaism, in virtue of a sort of reflection of the Old Testament, and to Islam in virtue of its borrowed lustre, any power of salvation. Jews and Moslems are not saved because of their religion but in spite of it. The Jews deny the messiahship of Jesus Christ, Moslems recognize Mohammed as the prophet *par excellence;* their good faith is of no value except by the implicit faith, that is, in the measure that their belief in supernatural Providence permits them to recover interiorly and unknown to them, in union with the Church, this Jesus Christ from whom they are officially separated. In effect, when their ignorance misconstrues or falsifies, without doubting it,

---

[31] "Quels sont ces moyens extraordinaires de salut? la révélation ne nous l'apprend pas. L'Eglise a reçu l'ordre, le pouvoir et le droit exclusif de conduire les âmes à Jésus-Christ; trésorière de la grâce rédemptrice, qu'elle dispense avec abondance par le saint sacrifice de la messe et les sacrements, elle ne sait pas comment la surabondance de sa richesse est accordée—extrasacramentellement—aux nombreux enfants qu'elle a parmi les infidèles, et qui, bien que sa prédication ne les atteigne point, se sauvent cependant à cause d'elle, par elle et en elle. Ce qui est certain, c'est que nul d'entre eux ne peut faire invisiblement partie de son corps visible, sans avoir la vie surnaturelle, sans un acte d'amour de Dieu ou de contrition parfaite, et cet acte de charité suppose tout au moins la conaissance de Dieu et de la Providence surnaturelle." *Ibid.,* 89.

> the historic realization of the providential design, this error of application, imputable to circumstances, leaves intact what is more important, namely a certain acquiescence to the will of God manifested by revelation. In the depths of their soul, in spite of their negation or their false dogma, they adhere unconsciously to the Church, since the complete and definitive revelation is the Christian revelation, and according to the will of God, Christianity and the Church are one whole.[32]

The religions themselves are "not a vehicle but a corruption of the revealed doctrine."[33] So that if elements of the truth are found in them they should be attributed rather to the religious nature of man which has preserved elements of the truth against the corrupting influence of the false religion; and not to the false religions themselves.

Secondly there is the possibility of interior inspiration by God; God is always free and able to grant the required knowledge of supernatural truths to a man who is doing what he can to achieve salvation. Again here the personal, internal aspect is stressed. The exterior religious atmosphere is not of importance; but rather the internal, personal relation of the man to God: "Whatever may be, exteriorly, the degree of civilization of a people, the love of God lives in the depths of hearts. It is there that grace is effective first of all. When it begins to lift the soul of an infidel toward God, its foundation is not exterior to man, in the elements of the false religion, often very grossly false; it is within the man, in the intimate convictions of his conscience."[34]

---

[32] "Certes, n'allons pas pour cela attribuer au Judaïsme, en vertu d'une sorte de reflet de l'Ancien Testament, à l'Islamisme, en vertu de son éclat emprunté, un pouvoir de salut quelconque. Juifs et Musulmans ne se sauvent pas *à cause* de leur religion, mais *malgré* elle. Les Juifs nient la messianité de Jésus-Christ, les Musulmans reconnaissent Mahomet comme le prophète par excellence; leur bonne foi ne peut valoir que par la foi implicite, c'est-à-dire dans la mesure où leur croyance en la Providence surnaturelle leur permet de ressaisir intérieurement et, à leur insu, dans l'union à l'Église, ce Jésus-Christ dont ils sont officiellement séparés. En Effet, lorsque leur ignorance méconnaît ou falsifie, sans s'en douter, la réalisation historique du dessein providentiel, cette erreur d'application, imputable aux circonstances, laisse vivre ce qui importe le plus, à savoir un acquiescement certain à la volonté de Dieu manifestée par la révélation. Par le fond de leur âme, en dépit de leur negation ou de leur faux dogme, ils adhérent inconsciemment à l'Église, puisque la révélation complète et definitive, c'est la révélation chrétienne, et que, selon la volonté de l'Homme-Dieu, le Christianisme et l'Église c'est tout un." *Ibid.,* 92.

[33] "Notons-le bien, en effet, les formes religieuses du paganisme ne sont pas tant un véhicule qu'une corruption de la doctrine révélée. . . ." *Ibid.,* 94.

In the development of the explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity, the study of Caperan marks the end of one phase and the beginning of another. His was a study of advanced thought and it was to direct the study of theologians to a more profound level. It is with very quick strokes that he rejects the use of the body-soul explanation and uses the *in re-in voto* distinction. With Caperan this view reaches the status of a commonplace; it is no longer an arguable point, but one to be assumed: the body-soul distinction is not useful in explaining the Church's necessity. The elaborate work of E. Hugon finds no echo here.

Brushing rather hurriedly past this preliminary point, Caperan takes up the consideration of the extraordinary means of salvation. From the very statement of the problem it is evident that Caperan sees the Church's necessity as absolute; that these means "do no harm to the extension or to the rights of the Church, remove nothing from the urgent necessity of the missions." He finishes by insisting once more that whoever benefits from the extraordinary means is saved "because of her, by her, and in her." In his consideration of the truths remaining in false religions and of interior inspiration by God, he emphasizes the personal aspect, demanding implicit faith and union with the Church. So it is not merely the good faith of these people, but rather their *implicit faith* and their union with the Church which is of benefit to them. This provides a fertile ground for establishing a *votum ecclesiae* in these people, though Caperan does not do so explicitly. Furthermore, Caperan never calls the Church herself the ordinary means of salvation, but rather the "living magisterium," the "apostolic ministry," and "exterior preaching," thus indicating that it is the Church acting upon her members or in strict theological terminology, union with the Church *in re* which is the ordinary means of salvation.

---

[34] "Quel que soit, à l'extérieur, le degré de civilisation d'un peuple, le sentiment de Dieu vit au fond des coeurs. C'est là que la grace frappe d'abord. Quand elle commence de soulever vers Dieu l'âme d'un infidèle, son point d'appui n'est pas en dehors de l'homme, dans les éléments d'une religion fausse, souvent très grossièrement fausse, il est au dedans de l'homme, dans les convictions intimes de la conscience." *Ibid.,* 99.

All of which can be harmonized with the view that the Church is an absolutely necessary means of salvation with which a man must be united in some way in order to attain salvation. However it is difficult to harmonize all of Caperan's remarks with this view. The whole tone of his long explanation of these extraordinary means of salvation is to the effect they are substitutes for the general means and the prime purpose of their existence is to effect salvation where the general means is inoperative. Thus the Church seems to be established for the salvation of the generality of mankind, but since secondary causes have rendered this ineffective in large areas, the extraordinary means have the precise purpose of taking the place of this general means in certain areas. This is a basic concept of these extraordinary means which Caperan makes very clear. It constitutes a very serious limitation of the concept of the Church as an absolutely necessary means of salvation. Again, Caperan describes these means as ones available to God, which God uses by acting directly upon the person, independently of the Church. There would seem, then, to be very serious discrepancies in Caperan's study.

However it should be kept in mind that the object of his study is the salvation of infidels. He is not concerned precisely with analyzing the Church's role in the process. So he seizes upon and examines every hypothesis which may contribute to a valid explanation. In the process he wishes to do no violence to the Church's exclusive claims, as he makes clear explicitly in several places. But since the Church's role is not his prime concern, he does not always relate each of his considerations to the Church. Thus there is a certain lack of clarity and an incompleteness in Caperan regarding the Church in the salvific process. What certainly is clear is that he is speaking against an understanding of the Church as an absolute, universal necessary means; but the particular aspects of his elaboration are not always explicitly harmonized with this view.

It is not surprising to find in a work of advanced thought, a certain lack of precision. Caperan's contribution to the development of this doctrine remains extremely important. He finalized the rejection of the body-soul distinction and the use of the *in re-in voto* explanation. He regarded the Church as an absolutely necessary means of salvation. While speaking of the extraordinary means of salvation, he insisted they do no violence to the Church's rights. In several particulars he left open the possibility of explaining that these means are used in dependence upon the Church through the dispositions of the individual. He was clear in refusing to call false religions means of salvation; salvation came to men in spite of these religions, not through them.

The major flaw in Caperan's study lies in his failure to tie explicitly and firmly the extraordinary means of salvation to the general means which is the Church. Indeed this conciliation seems possible only in part. So that imperfect understanding of the perspective of Caperan's treatment would lead one to believe he regarded the Church as merely the ordinary means of salvation; the extraordinary means being God's personal activity based upon the efficacy of the good elements present in all religions. Such would be an actual denial of the Church's exclusive claims. This failure to show clearly that such means are used actually in dependence upon the Church; that their efficacy is predicated upon the presence of a *votum ecclesiae* in the individual; and that in the final analysis whoever benefits from these means is saved *in ecclesia* and *per ecclesiam* is a most serious deficiency in Caperan's study.

3. JOHN VINCENT BAINVEL

In the same year, 1912, there appeared in *Etudes*[35] an article entitled "Hors de l'Eglise, pas de salut." The author was John Vincent Bainvel who had given the *nihil obstat* to Caperan's book. This article was published as a separate work the following year under the same title. The seven brief chapters of this work cover the whole question of the necessity of the Church. They consider the various explanations then in vogue and give what the author considered the best reconciliation of this axiom with the doctrine of the salvific will of God.

---

[35] J. V. Bainvel, "Hors de l'église pas de salut," *Etudes,* 132 (1912) 289-313.

Bainvel first rejects the explanation which solves the problem "by the assertion that good faith suffices for and insures salvation."[36] This, as he says, disregards the necessity of affiliation with the Church and leads to religious indifferentism; he rejects the body-soul explanation, stating pointedly that it is precisely affiliation with the body of the Church that is required. Likewise he rejects the explanation which holds it is necessary with the necessity of means to belong to the soul of the Church and necessary with the necessity of precept to belong to the body.

Having rejected all these attempts at an explanation, he advances a distinction which he views as essential to the understanding of the axiom: "The solution of the problem lies in the fact that we can be members of the Church in two ways, externally (visible) and internally (invisibly). This however needs some explanation."[37] It must never be supposed that there is but one way to be united with the Church, namely "either by an external and visible affiliation or by the soul's consciousness that it forms part of this body."[38] It has been advocated by theologians since the time of St. Thomas that the most important thing is not what man sees but what God sees and that: "As far as man can judge, many souls are apparently outside the pale of the Church, and yet these same souls in God's sight are united to the Church and are members of the Mystical Body of Jesus."[39] Thus the true solution to this problem is bound up with the distinction "between desire and reality, between the will and the fact, between internal affiliation with the Church and affiliation by the external ties of life and communion."[40]

With this preliminary distinction established, Bainvel then advances three general propositions which constitute his own explanation. First, union with the Church is necessary for salvation.

---

[36] J. V. Bainvel, *Is there Salvation Outside the Catholic Church?* trans. J. L. Weidenhan (St. Louis 1917) 25.

[37] *Ibid.*, 37.

[38] *Ibid.*, 38.

[39] *Ibid.*, 39.

[40] *Loc. cit.*

> In order to participate in the divine life, we must, in God's sight, belong to the Mystical Body of Christ; souls are not incorporated with Christ except in the Church. This is a revealed truth of which account must be taken, if we would rightly understand the workings of Providence on the souls of men in the economy of salvation. It is this very truth which is formulated in the axiom, "Outside the Church there is no salvation." Every man, bound to live the life of Jesus, must as a consequence do his best to enter the Church, the only organism in which Christ's life courses.[41]

Secondly, it is not possible for all men to fulfill God's desire in this regard: "But for many souls, this real entrance into the Church is impossible simply because they are not aware of the existence of a Church, much less that baptism is the rite by which incorporation into this society is gained."[42]

Thirdly, there is a special Providence to care for those for whom real entrance into the Church is simply impossible: "There is, according to the opinion of St. Augustine, for each soul in particular, a supernatural Providence insuring graces which flow upon the soul independently of all ordinary channels; if such souls are faithful to these graces, they will inevitably, without any visible communion with the Church and Christian preaching, come to the knowledge of the sum of supernatural truths necessary to make the acts of faith and charity insuring salvation."[43]

It might appear that this explanation destroys the concept of the Church as an absolute necessity for salvation, since God aids by means of an extraordinary economy those who cannot benefit from the ministrations of the Church. However Bainvel is quick to disavow any such meaning of his words. There are, he says two supplementary points to be considered. These when united form a "theological solution of the problem which reconciles all the facts of the case."[44]

---

[41] *Ibid.*, 40-41.

[42] *Ibid.*, 41.

[43] *Ibid.*, 41-42.

The first of these points is the more important, as well as the more involved:

> First of all, the axiom may be understood as referring to the ordinary workings of Providence, that is to say, it is the rule and not the exception. It is indeed the order desired by God, the rule He lays down, that all shall be saved within the Church. The exceptional cases, be they ever so numerous—and they are less numerous than appears at first sight—are outside the divine intention (*praeter intentionem, per accidens*) because of the fault of the human will, and are supplied by God with extraordinary economy, a special Providence, granted in the measure of the necessity. That they live in the Church cannot be doubted, but they do not live in it fully.[45]

Thus following the explanation of St. Augustine and Msgr. d'Hulst, we must understand the axiom as referring to the ordinary economy, the official economy: "It makes no pretence to, nor does it actually embrace the exceptional cases which are outside the usual order of God's ways, and depend exclusively on those mysterious laws of the divine action in the soul of each man, laws which God has not deigned to reveal. . . ."[46] What the axiom means is that the Church "is essentially the society of salvation and that there is none other, for he who desires eternal life must enter her fold."[47] God has given this Church such marks that in the normal course of events, a man who does not blind himself to the truth will be given the opportunity of knowing the Church and her divine institution. Anyone who does not gain this knowledge has only himself to blame and "therefore in the order of Providence no one can be saved without entering the Church."[48] However God has willed that his plan for the salvation of men should be administered by men and so there is much room for the weakness of man to interfere with and even prevent the working out of this divine plan. Yet this does not prevent God from effecting the salvation of men, for: "despite this opposition on the part of man, God can and does come into immediate contact with souls. Nevertheless it is still true that the normal and regular channel of His action is the Church, the mistress of truth and the dispensatrix of His graces."[49] This is the true meaning of the axiom then, that it is God's plan *as He has revealed it to us;* it is the ordinary way, in which he desires men to be saved: "This solution founded on the distinction between the ordinary Providence of God, which He has revealed to us, and His extraordinary Providence whereby He mysteriously supplies the weakness and overcomes the opposition arising from secondary causes, is fully justified by the data of the problem. We must understand our axiom in the sense of referring to the *per se* and not the *per accidens;* to the general economy, and not to individual souls."[50]

---

[44] *Ibid.,* 42.

[45] *Ibid.,* 43.

[46] *Ibid.,* 44.

[47] *Ibid.,* 45.

[48] *Loc. cit.*

Souls then can be saved by the workings of the *per accidens* economy of salvation, whereby God is able to overcome any opposition which has resulted from the exercise of man's free will. There is nevertheless a close connection between this *per accidens* economy and the general Providence of God: "In actual life, how many there are who live in the Church and by the Church, who live on the truth which she teaches and share in the graces of which she is the depository, without realizing at all what they owe her."[51] Such souls are saved through the Church because all their graces come from the Church and lead to the Church. They come from the Church, for whatever good exists in the various communions comes ultimately from the Church who is the guardian of the graces of Christ. They lead to the Church, for directly the person recognizes the Church as Christ's, he will embrace it; if he never recognizes it, death will see him receive in and through her the fulness of Christ living in His Mystical Body:

> All these souls belong then in some fashion to the Church in this, namely, that the graces they receive are

---

[49] *Ibid.,* 46.
[50] *Ibid.,* 47.
[51] *Loc. cit.*

> due to the merits of Christ, the mystical Head of the Church and flow, as it were, from the grandcurrent issuing from the Head to His members in His Mystical Body. Then too, they receive these graces as pledges of eventually coming, either in this world or in the next into living unity with this Mystical Body. They are members of the Church according to divine intention; they belong to her at heart and until they are incorporated into the Mystical Body of Christ, either in this world or in the next, they walk in the light of truth and are already living her life.[52]

God grants to these people whatever is necessary to obtain salvation. But these gifts he gives them cannot be compared to what he gives his children in His Church. They are rather the crumbs fallen from the table. This concept the author says, will become clearer when it is explained how these people stand in relation to the Church, or how they "are affiliated with her by invisible ties and are her members at heart."[53]

The explanation of this invisible union is the second concept Bainvel advances to clarify the general view of the doctrine which he has expressed above. For these people who benefit from the extraordinary economy of salvation are affiliated with the Church unconsciously and this suffices: "Souls affiliated with the Church unconsciously are united to her by invisible ties, for they are affiliated with her internally, by an implicit desire, which God is pleased to regard as equivalent to external membership."[54] Bainvel reminds us that the objective reality of the economy of salvation is that all be saved in the Church. Here however he is considering "the subjective part which each soul plays in order thus to enter this providential ark of salvation. . . ."[55] This entrance is gained by an implicit desire. This desire is possessed by all those who earnestly seek to fulfill all God has ordained for their salvation: "The soul who desires to live the divine life, desires at the same time to live in the normal environment in which this divine life abounds, where the influence of the Holy Spirit, as in its proper sphere of action, has full play. Implicitly, then, such a soul desires to belong to the very body of the Church."[56]

---

[52] *Ibid.,* 50.
[53] *Ibid.,* 53.
[54] *Ibid.,* 54.
[55] *Ibid.,* 56.

In God's sight the value of a soul is determined by its interior sentiments and not by external acts. Thus the internal affiliation with the Church is most acceptable to God: "Hence, we can understand that affiliation or non-affiliation with the Church by visible ties and outward communion, may be to Him, if we may use the expression, something altogether secondary and unimportant. The distinction between the visible and the invisible is important only to us, since for God all is visible."[57] Since God sees things as they are and not merely as they appear to be we "can truly count as members of the Church all those who are united to God in faith and charity in a degree sufficient to secure their salvation."[58] By far the most important single item in the process of salvation of such people is their affiliation to the Church. They benefit from an extraordinary economy, they benefit from the direct action of God, but still the keystone of the whole process is the union with the Church: "From the fact that God forges, by some mysterious process, the invisible ties by which all souls of good faith and good will, and those faithful to divine grace are united to the Church, we are forced again to conclude . . . that this affiliation, far from being a side or secondary consideration for these souls, is on the contrary a matter of life and death."[59]

These two concepts fully supplement Bainvel's explanation; having exposed them he sums up his treatment briefly: "Consequently, although it may be truly said that there have been souls who have gained salvation outside the Church, we cannot say, because of this fact, that salvation is equally possible for those without as well as for those within the Church, since those very souls who are saved outside the Church (that is, without being, properly speaking, members of the visible Church) are not saved except by the Church and in so far as they are her members."[60]

---

[56] *Ibid.,* 57.

[57] *Ibid.,* 59-60.

[58] *Ibid.,* 60.

[59] *Ibid.,* 61.

[60] *Ibid.,* 62.

Bainvel's explanation, like that of Caperan, is a composite. It attempts to unite in one complete explanation an understanding of the Church as the manifestation of God's ordinary Providence together with the traditional *in re-in voto* explanation. He begins by stating that union with the Church is an absolute necessity for salvation; but then in describing the extraordinary Providence which benefits so many people, he seems to be far from the position of absolute necessity in regard to the Church. He sees the axiom as referring to the official economy, the general economy; it does not actually embrace the exceptional cases etc. The basic structure of this exposition seems faulty.

He describes successively an ordinary economy which is based upon the Church and an extraordinary economy which is not based upon the Church. He traces these two aspects of his explanation and claims that they do no injury to the rights of the Church. However one portion of his remarks are clearly destructive of any concept of the Church as an absolute means of salvation. Another portion with equal clarity supports such a concept. The conclusion seems inescapable that there is an inherent contradiction here. In effect Bainvel says that there is an extraordinary economy of salvation to care for those who cannot benefit from the ordinary; yet no one can benefit from the extraordinary economy unless he is united to the institution which dispenses the ordinary economy, i.e. the Church. Those benefiting from the extraordinary economy of salvation belong to the Church in some fashion since the graces they receive come from the Church and lead to the Church; they are also truly members of the Church since they are her members "at heart."

All of which seems to point out sharply that Bainvel's two basic principles cannot be harmonized. For if such people "live in the Church," even though "not fully," if they are her members "at heart" they are using the one means God has established to effect man's salvation and they can hardly be said to be cared for by an extraordinary economy. Rather they are using the one absolute necessary means. They are complying with God's wishes and so mention of an extraordinary economy seems pointless.

If we were to accept the proposition that the necessity of the Church is actually a necessity for membership in the Church, then perhaps the two principles can be reconciled. Membership would be the "ordinary workings of Providence" and we could logically speak of an extraordinary economy to care for the exceptions; namely those who are prevented (with no fault of their own) by the activity of the free will of men, from becoming members of the Church. Indeed it often seems that Bainvel's "ordinary economy of salvation" is just that: membership in the Church.

This does not reflect the fullness of the Church's necessity. That doctrine expresses not the necessity of membership, but the necessity of the Church herself. Pius IX clearly stated that this doctrine has never, and must never be interpreted as indicating a necessity of membership in the Church.[61]

Taken in its entirety Bainvel's explanation seems composed of two radically irreconcilable principles and thus is a confusing presentation. Taken by itself his description of the extraordinary economy could do grave harm to the rights of the Church. Finally we take note that in several places Bainvel uses the term member in a wide sense; for example "we can truly count as members of the Church all those who are united to God in faith and charity in a degree sufficient to secure their salvation."[62]

4. SUMMARY

Between the publication of E. Hugon's book and Caperan's, there were not many new theological treatises. Schiffini and Van Laak expounded the *in re-in voto* explanation. This is mentioned also by Ottiger who held that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation. Naulaerts repeated Hugon's explanation. All the other authors used the simple body-soul explanation, either alone or in conjunction with other exlanations. Prevel used it along with the *in re-in voto* explanation. Moulard-Vincent, Lesetre, Labourt, Hugueny and the anonymous *Cours elemtaire de théologie* all use the simple body-soul explanation. This is not in harmony with the continuing tendency to set aside this explanation as unsatisfactory. Yet this phenomenon is understandable. All of the above works are apologetic or catechetical rather than strictly theological. The use of the body-soul explanation reflects the continued slowness of catechists and apologists to discontinue use of this explanation even after it had been shown to be theologically unacceptable.

---

[61] See above, 26.

[62] J. V. Bainvel, *op. cit.,* 60. See also *ibid.,* 62.

Caperan describes the necessity of the Church as an absolute one; in investigating the extraordinary means of salvation, he had no intention of weakening that necessity in the slightest. But due to a certain lack of clarity and precision, there is some difficulty in reconciling the whole of his study with such a view of the Church's necessity.

Bainvel, repeating the explanation of Caperan, did not have the latter's delicacy and his description of the extraordinary economy of salvation is opposed to his contention that union with the Church is an absolute necessity for salvation. Further both he and Caperan have employed the term member in a wide sense. Since both Bainvel and Caperan received wide acceptance, their combined influence was certainly great. In regard to this doctrine, they left to theologians a rather confusing presentation.

The increasing attention given at the beginning of the century to the concept of the Church as the ordinary means of salvation is reflected in the two major studies made of this doctrine. Caperan speaks of ordinary and extraordinary means of salvation; Bainvel, of ordinary and extraordinary economies of salvation. So strong however had become the use of the *in re-in voto* explanation that both authors used it and strove to show that it was not weakened by their ordinary-extraordinary distinctions. This represents a third stage in the development of this doctrine. At first distinction was made in the Church itself, between the body and the soul; then it was made in the manner of pertaining to the Church, *in re* or *in voto;* here the distinction is placed upon the very nature of the economy of salvation God has established. There are two economies: ordinary and extraordinary. A whole new area of speculation is thus introduced into the explanation of the doctrine.

Strangely the explanation of Hugon found little acceptance in these first years. Caperan makes no mention of it; Bainvel apparently misunderstands it. Only Naulaerts among the other authors adopts it.

CHAPTER VI

From Caperan to Adam

1. AUTHORS FROM CAPERAN TO ADAM

It might seem that after the studies of Bainvel and Caperan there was not another significant work until the appearance of Karl Adam's *Spirit of Catholicism* in 1926. While Adam's work was widely accepted and has been frequently quoted, in regard to the doctrine of the Church's necessity it is open to serious objection. Furthermore the period from 1913 to 1926 is one which can boast of several excellent treatises of this doctrine. Therefore before considering the explanation of Karl Adam, we shall review the theologians of this intervening period.

In 1914 Muncunill expresses the doctrine in this thesis: "It is necessary with the necessity of precept for each adult to enter the true Church, and to remain in it until death, there is even a necessity of means *in voto,* not however *in re.*"[1] Concerning this necessity of means *in voto* he says:

> . . . entrance into the Church is not only necessary to avoid committing a sin, but also because in her and in her alone are there all the means of sanctification and salvation. Therefore in order for the person who does not actually enter the Church to attain salvation, he must be either explicitly or implicitly disposed to enter. Not precisely to avoid a sin, but in order that he might have the means necessary for sanctification and salvation.—Therefore entrance into the Church is necessary by necessity of means *in voto.*[2]

---

[1] "Necessarium necessitate praecepti est singulis hominibus adultis veram Ecclesiam ingredi, in eademque usque ad mortem permanere, imo necessitate medii in voto, non tamen in re." J. Muncunill, *Tractatus de Christi ecclesia* (Barcinnone 1914) 259.

[2] ". . . ingressus in Ecclesiam non est tantum necessarius ad peccatum vitandum, verum etiam quia in illa habentur, et per se tantum in illa, omnia media ad sanctificationem et ad salutem obtinendam. Ergo qui actu Ecclesiam

There is no necessity *in re* to enter the Church since it is possible for a man to belong to the soul of the Church and not the body and thus attain salvation.[3] So Muncunill bases his explanation on the *in re-in voto* distinction but still attaches enough importance to the body-soul explanation to mention it. Dorsch writes: "The Church of Christ is necessary in such a way that he who departing from this life is found within that Church in no way, cannot obtain eternal salvation."[4] He bases this necessity upon the doctrine regarding Baptism and also upon the doctrine of the Mystical Body. Concerning the latter he states: "In the present order no one can attain salvation, unless he pertain to the body of Christ in some way and receive from Him a salutary influence in a stable and vital manner."[5] Thus it is continually entrance into the Church in some way that Dorsch requires. In certain cases this may be fulfilled if the person enters the Church only in desire. Cristiani uses the same *in re-in voto* explanation.[6] Still in the same year, 1914, there appeared the first edition of Canon's Hervé's *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae*. He expresses the doctrine thus: "The Church of Christ is necessary for all men for salvation."[7] This necessity is one of both precept and means: in certain cases it is sufficient to pertain to the body of the Church *in voto*. Hervé also uses Hugon's explanation: a person must belong to the soul of the Church *in re* and the body of the Church at least *in voto*. The axiom expressing the necessity of the Church concerns only

---

non ingreditur, ut salutem consequi possit, debet esse ad hoc explicite vel implicite dispositus, non praecise ad peccatum vitandum, sed ad habenda media necessaria ad sanctificationem et salutem.—Ergo ingressus in Ecclesiam est necessarius necessitate medii in voto." *Ibid.*, 262.

[3] See *ibid.*, 263.

[4] "Ecclesia Christi ita est necessaria ut, qui hinc decedentes in ea nullo modo inveniantur, salutem nequeant obtinere aeternam." A. Dorsch, *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* *I* (2 ed., Oeniponte 1928) 539.

[5] "Salutem in hoc ordine nemo potest assequi, nisi aliquo modo ad corpus Christi pertineat et ab ipso influxum salutarem recipiat per modum stabilem et vitalem. . . ." *Ibid.*, 546.

[6] "Hors de son sein, pas de salut. Il faut être son enfant, au moins par le désir, pour être dans la voie qui mene à Dieu et au bonheur." L. Cristiani, *Pages doctrinales. Jésus-Christ et l'église.* (Paris 1914) 125.

[7] "Ecclesia Christi est omnibus hominibus ad salutem necessaria." M. J. Hervé, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* 1 (Paris 1914) 56.

those who are culpably outside the Church: " 'Outside the Church no salvation' means only that no one can be saved who at the time of his death is outside the Church because of his own grave fault."[8]

Bishop d'Herbigny in his *Theologica de ecclesia* words the thesis very simply: "From the institution of Christ, the Church is a necessary means for the salvation of every man."[9] He then explains the terms necessity of means and of precept. The former is either relative or absolute. Absolute is that which is metaphysically required; relative is that which is freely instituted by God who chooses one of several possible means. God can supply substitutes for this means, but man cannot: "He Himself (God) can provide for exceptions or supplementary remedies. However the person obliged to the end cannot dissolve the established order or choose other means; therefore if he willfully neglects the things necessary, he will not obtain the end."[10] The Church is necessary with both the necessity of means and the necessity of precept. D'Herbigny then distinguishes between internal union with the Church and its external manifestation. In certain cases the latter can be supplied for by an implicit desire in such wise that the individual participates in the life of the Church, though he may not realize it. The presence of this *votum* is the reason for the supernatural life which he possess:

> Since God has established in Christ such an order that sanctifying grace may be obtained *de se* only through the Church, he has thereby made the Church a necessary means of salvation. Therefore a union, at least internal, with the Church is a necessary means for the infusion of grace into a soul; however where the external manifestation or even the consciousness of that participation is inculpably impossible, it can be supplied for with remedies,

---

[8] "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus nil aliud intelligitur nisi neminem salvari posse qui *gravi sua culpa* extra veram Ecclesiam moritur." *Ibid.,* 57.

[9] "Ex institutione Christi, Ecclesia est medium ad singulorum ad salutem necessarium." M. d'Herbigny, *Theologica de ecclesia* 1 (Paris 1914) 149.

[10] "Ipse (Deus) quoque potest de exceptionibus aut suppletivis *remediis* curare. Obligatus autem ad finem nequit dissolvere illas connexiones, aut alia media eligere: proinde, si sponte neglexerit necessaria, finem non obtinebit." *Ibid.,* 152.

> namely by internal acts or by desire. There is included in this desire the serious will of using all the means which God has established and shown to be necessary. By such a desire even the person who does not explicitly know all the individual means has already received them all implicitly. Therefore through grace which precedes and elevates the acts of faith and charity, he is justified and made capable of salvation, having participated, though unconsciously, in the life of the Church.[11]

So for d'Herbigny the *votum Ecclesiae* effected a real union with the Church and thus made salvation possible.

After explaining the meaning of the doctrine, d'Herbigny proceeds to demonstrate it by means of the following syllogism: "From the institution of Christ, only those are saved who pertain to Christ. But those culpably outside the Church do not pertain to Christ. Therefore, from the institution of Christ, those who are culpably outside the Church are not saved."[12] In explaining the minor, the author calls attention to the words *culpa sua*. For one who is outside the Church through no fault of his own may have entered the Church in desire and thus would not be excluded from salvation: "One who is in inculpable ignorance if he enter the Church at least in desire and longing, partakes of the Church according to the measure of his knowledge and obligation, even though he does not pertain to the visible and external communion of the Church. For 'communication of the Holy Spirit and participation in the truth and life is not obtained except in the Church and through the Church' (lac. 7, 591; cf. schema, cp. VI; p. 569)."[13]

---

[11] "Quoniam vero Deus in Christo ita connexiones instituit ut gratia sanctificans obtineretur de se solummodo per Ecclesiam, libere Ecclesiam fecit medium necessarium salutis. Connexio ergo saltem interna cum Ecclesia est medium necessarium ut animabus gratia infundatur; manifestatio vero externa vel etiam conscientia illius participationis, ubi inculpabiliter fit impossibilis suppleri potest remediis, i.e. actibus internis, seu voto. In hoc voto includitur voluntas seria adhibendi omnia quae Deus constituerit et manifestaverit adhibenda. Tali voto ille etiam qui non cognoscit explicite singula media, iam illa cuncta suscipit implicite. Proinde per gratiam, quae illos fidei caritatisque actus praevenit et elevat, iustificatur et fit salutis capax, participata etiam inconscie vita Ecclesiae." *Ibid.,* 152-153.

[12] "Ex institutione Christi, illi soli salvantur qui ad Christum pertinent. Atqui versantes culpa sua extra Ecclesiam non pertinent ad Christum: Ergo, ex institutione Christi, ii qui versantur culpa sua extra Ecclesiam, non salvantur." *Ibid.,* 155.

D'Herbigny's exposition is certainly to be classified as the *in re-in voto* explanation; yet his treatment does not represent the best possible arrangement of his material. His statement of the thesis, exposition of the terms involved and the description of the *votum* are all in the classic tradition. However the syllogism with which he demonstrates the doctrine is based upon the consideration of culpability and thus is not too cogent. True, in explaining the minor of the syllogism, he gives a true exposition of the *votum;* but is it not possible to be in invincible ignorance and still not have the *votum ecclesiae?* There is a possibility here that the absence of culpability in not being a member of the Church will be equated with the possession of the *votum.* The wording of d'Herbigny's syllogism is not in harmony with the traditional nature of the remainder of his exposition.

In 1917 Sertillanges deals briefly with the question of the necessity of the Church. The word Church in the statement "Outside the Church no salvation" can be interpreted in two ways: ". . . if by the word *Church* we mean the visible group that we enrolled Catholics form, the formula *Outside the Church no salvation* is no more than an official truth, which life outruns in every direction, and by which the Spirit, *which bloweth where it willeth,* will not agree to be bound."[14] The word Church can also be taken to mean "the universal society of souls united to God through Christ under the influence of grace" and in that case, Father Sertillanges continues: ". . . *Outside the Church no salva-*

---

[13] "Inculpabiliter ignorans, si 'Ecclesiam in voto saltem et desiderio ingreditur,' licet 'advisibilem externamque Ecclesiae communionem non spectet,' fit tamen pro mensura suae cognitionis et obligationis particeps Ecclesiae. Nam 'communicatio Sancti Spiritus, participatic veritatis et vitae non obtinetur, nisi in Ecclesia et per Ecclesiam' (Lac. 7, 591; cf. schema, cp. VI; p. 569)." *Ibid.,* 156.

[14] "Mais il faut bien comprendre que si l'on entend par ce mot: Église, le groupe visible que nous formons, nous, catholiques enrôlés, la formule *hors de l'Eglise point de salut,* n'est plus qu'une vérité officielle, que la vie déborde dans tous les sens, et dont l'Esprit, qui souffle où il veut, ne se constitue point prisonnier." A. D. Sertillanges, *L'Eglise* (Paris 1917) 2.130.

tion signifies merely Outside God, no salvation; outside solidarity with Christ the Saviour and Mediator, no salvation; outside that good will which unites to God as Father and Christ as Brother every man who does not refuse grace with a positive and pertinacious refusal, no salvation. In a word: Outside the good, no salvation, and that is a thing obvious in itself."[15]

Sertillanges does not accept the word Church as signifying the Roman Catholic Church but rather all men of good will: ". . . the Church, fundamentally, coincides with humanity itself, if by humanity we mean, in the moral sense, the society of those who are governed by the law of mankind."[16] These are indeed generous and wide interpretations of the traditional axiom of the necessity of the Church; however the author insists that they in no way reflect upon the importance of the visible structure of the Catholic Church: "These wide thoughts cannot detach us from the visible and sanctifying body of our Church, since it remains well understood that for the man who knows it or can know it, for him who is born and is able to persevere in its communion, it is this Church and it alone which represents salvation."[17] Sertillanges' understanding of the word Church used here leaves little meaning to the axiom "Outside the Church no salvation." In his final words he barely justifies the presence of some sort of necessity of precept. Even a cursory reading of this explanation is sufficient to show how far it is from the traditional understanding of this doctrine.

In 1917 Prunel proposes two necessities which seem to be contradictory. He states: "1. It is necessary, as a general and absolute rule, to belong to the Catholic Church in order to be saved; and here we understand by Church the body of the Church. . . . 2. Salvation is possible for every man of good faith, even those outside the body of the Catholic Church."[18] Prunel reconciles the apparent opposition by explaining what he means by the phrase "as a general and absolute rule." It signifies only what may be called a necessity of precept. "But outside of the general rule there are exceptions; outside of the ordinary providential means, there are extraordinary means which God can use to save men of good faith; who are outside the Church. . . ."[19] There is no conflict with the principle he has established above; for the necessity of belonging to the body of the Church is merely one of precept: ". . . if it is impossible to observe the precept, the necessity of precept disappears, giving way to the necessity of means. For the means necessary for salvation is union with the soul of the Church; consequently all who belong to this soul, are saved, even though they may not form part of the visible Church."[20] According to this interpretation only those who are culpably outside the Church would be excluded from salvation. Prunel continues his explanation, stating that this represents only one view of the doctrine; there is a "new application" which he ascribes to J. Bainvel: "It is necessary to belong to it in fact, really; it suffices to belong to it in desire, at heart."[21] Though less development is given to this second explanation, it seems to be favored by Prunel over the body-soul explanation he exposed first. He says that this second explanation built around the *in re-in voto* distinction is "based upon weighty authorities and is more satisfying, perhaps, than that based upon the body and soul of the Church."[22]

---

[15] ". . . *hors de l'Eglise point de salut,* cela signifie seulement: hors de Dieu, point de salut; hors de la solidarité avec le Christ sauveur et médiateur, point de salut; hors de la bonne volonté qui unit a Dieu Père et au Christ Frère quiconque ne se refuse point à la grâce d'un refus positif et pertinace, point de salut. En un mot: hors du bien, point de salut, et cela est une évidence." *Loc. cit.*

[16] ". . . l'Église, au fond, coïncide avec l'humanité elle-même, si l'on entend par humanité, au sens moral, le groupe de ceux qui se donnent à la loi de l'homme." *Ibid.,* 131.

[17] "Ces larges pensées ne peuvent pas nous détacher du corps visible et sanctifiant de notre Église, puisqu'il demeure bien entendu que pour celui qui sait ou qui peut savòir, pour celui qui est né et qui peut persévérer dans sa communion, c'est elle, et elle seule, qui représente le salut." *Ibid.,* 132.

---

[18] "1. Qu'il faut, en règle générale et absolue, appartenir à l'Église catholique pour faire son salut, et l'on entend par la le corps de l'Église. . . . 2. Que le salut est possible à toute âme de bonne foi même en dehors du corps de l'Église Catholique." L. Prunel, *L'Eglise* (17 ed., Paris 1924) 139.

[19] "Mais en dehors de la règle générale, il y a l'exception; en dehors du moyen providentiel ordinnaire, il y a les moyens extraordinaires que Dieu peut employer sauver les âmes de bonne foi; qui sont hors de l'Église. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

[20] ". . . si le precepte est impossible à observer, la necessité de precepte disaparait devant la necessité de moyen. Or le moyen necessaire pour être sauve c'est d'appartenir à l'âme de l'Église, et par consequent tous ceux qui appartiennent à cette âme sont sauvés, alors même qu'ils ne feraient pas partie de l'Église visible." *Ibid.,* 140.

[21] "Il est necessaire d'appartenir à l'Église pour être sauvé mais il n'est pas necessaire de lui appartenir en fait, *re;* it suffit qu'on lui appartienne de désir par le coeur, *voto.*" *Ibid.,* 142.

Verhelst in 1918 writes: "Belonging to the Church is a necessary means of salvation, and not just a useful, desirable but superfluous aid which a man is free to refuse."[23] This necessity however is not a universal one and so Verhelst rejects both the body-soul and *re-voto* explanation because they are attempts to generalize a doctrine that has only particular application.

> Some authors believe that they can generalize the axiom "Outside the Church no salvation," by saying that non-Catholics who are in good faith belong to the soul of the Church and that suffices. This interpretation goes against the sense of Tradition which has had in view the visible Church, as the classic example of the ark of Noe shows. Others think that it suffices to belong to the visible Church through an implicit desire (the will to do all that God prescribes). But the desire of a good supposes its absence. He who is saved by the desire of being in the Church, is saved in reality outside the Church. Therefore the expedient of belonging in desire does not generalize the axiom. For those who know that the necessity of belonging to the Church is not absolute, not exclusive of other means of salvation (and there is no doubt about this), the question offers no difficulty. There is no need of trying to generalize an axiom which is not general.[24]

---

[22] ". . . basée sur des graves authorités théologiques est plus satisfaisante peut-être que celle du corps et de l'âme de l'Église." *Ibid.,* 143-144.

[23] "L'appartenance à l'Église est un moyen necessaire du salut, et non pas un secours utile et desirable mais surerogatoire qu'on serait libre de refuser." F. Verhelst, *Dogmatique* (Bruxelles 1918) 42.

[24] "Des auteurs croient pouvoir generaliser l'axoime 'Hors de l'Église point de salut' en disant que les egarés de bonne foi appartiennent à l'âme de l'Église et que celà suffit. Cette interpretation va à l'encontre du sens de la Tradition qui a en vue l'Église visible, ainsi qu'il appert de l'exemple classique de l'ârche de Noe. D'autres estiment qu'il suffit d'appartenir à l'Église visible par le désir au moins implicite (la volonté de faire ce que

Verhelst maintains that three considerations are essential to a proper understanding of this axiom: "It is a matter here of actual (and not virtual, by implicite or explicit desire) belonging to the visible Church (and not to the soul of the Church). In the second place, this belonging is a necessary means of salvation, as the example of the Ark of Noe shows. Thirdly, this necessity is not absolute but conditional, since it admits of exception."[25] He finds these exceptions in the many good people who are not Catholics and yet who attain salvation through the mercy of God: "It is beyond doubt that God does not cruelly condemn these lost sheep. They can be saved then outside the Church. Therefore the Church is not the only means of salvation for all men; the true meaning of the axiom is therefore contained in the statement: "There is no salvation for the man who, through his own fault, dies outside the Church."[26] He concludes by saying that these "lost sheep" have good will and: "This good will merits for them a real participation in the graces of salvation which go beyond and surpass the Church."[27] We have here also, as with the explanation of Sertillanges, a view which is much at variance with the traditional understanding of this doctrine.

Dieu prescrit) mais le désir d'un bien en suppose l'absence. Celui qui se sauvé par le désir être dans l'Église, se sauvé en realité hors d'elle. Donc l'expedient de l'appartenance in voto ne generalise pas l'axiome. Pour qui convient que le necessité d'appartenir à l'Église n'est pas absolue, exclusive d'autres moyens de salut (et celà n'est pas douteux), la question n'offre pas aucune difficulté. Il ne faut pas vouloir generaliser un axiome qui n'est pas général." *Ibid.,* 44.

[25] "Il s'agit ici de l'appartenance *actuelle* (et non virtuelle, par un désir implicite ou explicite) à l'Église *visible* (et non à l'âme de l'Eglise). En second lieu, cette appartenance est un moyen nécessaire du salut, comme le montre l'exemple de l'arche de Noe. En troisieme lieu, cette nécessité n'est pas *absolue,* mais conditionnelle, puisqu'elle comporte des exceptions." *Ibid.,* 42.

[26] "Il est cependant hors de doubte que Dieu ne reprove pas inexorablement ces 'brebis errantes.' Elles peuvent donc se sauver hors de l'Église. Donc celle-ci n'est pas l'unique moyen du salut pour tous, el l'on aura le sens precis de l'axiome en disant: Point de salut pour quiconque meurt hors de l'Église par sa faute." *Ibid.,* 43.

[27] "Cette bonne volonté leur vaut une réelle participation aux grâces du salut qui decoulent et debordent de l'Église." *Ibid.,* 44.

Felder in 1920 demands some union with the Church: "Objectively the Church, by the will of Christ, is the only mediatrix of salvation; so subjectively, no one can be saved unless he is united to the Church in some manner."[28] In clarifying the meaning of this statement, Felder writes: ". . . participation with the Church is a condition without which no one is saved. For although God Himself gives sanctifying grace, he has willed that this grace be communicated to men through the ministry of the Church. So whoever is not united with the Church in some way cannot be saved."[29] But this necessity of union with the Church may be satisfied by union in desire: "Whoever cannot be united to the Church really, but is bound to it in desire, is not excluded from salvation."[30] Felder states that people who have this desire are united to the soul of the Church, even though they are not united to the body: ". . . although they do not pertain to the body of the Church, they do pertain to the soul of the Church, i.e. they benefit by the manifold strength of the graces dispensed by the Church."[31] Though Felder uses the *in re-in voto* explanation, there is a difference in his understanding of the votum; it attaches a person to the soul of the Church, not to the body.

Walker also refers briefly to the *in re-in voto* explanation in an essay entitled "Exclusive Claims—Catholic and Roman."[32] We can say there is no salvation outside the Church "since those who may, and do save their souls, though in body without, do not save them because they are without, but because, having accepted Christ and being ever ready and eager to do His will, in intention and spirit they are already within."[33]

---

[28] "Objective ecclesia ex voluntate Christi dicitur sola mediatrix salutis ita, ut subjective nemo salutem obtineat, nisi cum ecclesia aliquo modo coniungatur." H. Felder, *Apologetica sive theologia fundamentalis* (ed. altera Paderbornae 1923) 20.

[29] ". . . participatio cum ecclesia est condicio sine qua nemo salvatur. Nam licet Deus ipse infundat gratiam sanctificantem, voluit tamen gratiam hanc per ecclesiae ministerium hominibus comunicari. Ergo qui nullo nodo cum ecclesia coniungitur, aeternae salutis impos est." *Loc. cit.*

[30] "Qui re cum ecclesia coniungi nequit, voto tamen eam amplexatur, a salute non excluditur." *Loc. cit.*

[31] ". . . quamvis ad corpus ecclesiae non pertineat, pertinet nihilominus ad animam ecclesiae, i.e. subit multiplicem vim gratiarum ab ecclesia dispensatarum." *Ibid.,* 20-21.

[32] L. Walker, "Exclusive Claims—Catholic and Roman," *The Problem of Reunion* (London 1920).

Also in 1920 there appeared a collection of essays published under the title *God and the Supernatural.* Among the essays was one by E. I. Watkin entitled, "The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ." In the first section the author explains his concept of solidarity and the "Pauline doctrine of our salvation by membership in the Church-society. . . ."[34] He makes it clear that the criterion of membership here is unity in the life of Christ. His whole description of the Church is as an invisible society and the only bond of union with this Church is the spiritual bond of grace. This explanation, standing by itself is open to serious objection and the author himself recognizes the fact and devotes the second section of the essay to a complementary exposition. He states:

> If my essay ended here, no Catholic could feel that I had given a sufficient account of the Church. My account might perhaps satisfy the anti-ecclesiastical Protestant, but it could not be acceptable to a Catholic. For I have spoken only of an invisible Church of souls united by the purely spiritual bond of the Spirit and by union with an invisible Head, the glorified Christ. But to the Catholic this is only one aspect of the truth of the Church. For he is essentially a member of a visible body into which he is incorporated by a visible sacrament; and in this incorporation he is maintained by visible sacraments.[35]

This invisible Church is found also in the writings of St. Paul although he does not "explicitly distinguish between them. For him the visible body is the invisible in its external aspect."[36] This relation between the visible and the invisible Church calls for closer examination: ". . . St. Paul seems to teach a simple identity between the invisible and visible Church. Does it follow that this simple identity is the actual relationship? Must we say that the Spirit-soul is operative only in those who are members of the one visible Church? Is the maxim *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* to be understood in its most obvious and literal sense without qualification of any kind?"[37]

---

[33] *Ibid.,* 214-215.

[34] E. I. Watkin, "The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ." *God and the Supernatural* (London 1920) 161. This was reprinted without change in 1954.

[35] *Ibid.,* 174.

[36] *Loc. cit.*

Obviously a distinction must be made somewhere since we cannot conclude "that no one on earth could enjoy the supernatural life of grace-union with God, however invincible his ignorance of God's will in this regard, unless he were incorporated into the visible Church and continued in that visible membership."[38] Watkin is going to make that distinction by giving different extensions to the visible and the invisible Church. He first explains why St. Paul did not make a similar distinction:

> If St. Paul nowhere makes any distinction between the invisible and the visible Church, it is because he is laying down the divine economy of salvation. According to this economy every regenerate soul is also a member of the visible Church. Hence those souls who are members of the invisible Church, without embodying that membership of the visible Church, are in a position essentially false, a condition contrary to the divine plan, and it is only their implicit will to be members of the visible Church (if they knew that such was the will of God) that enables them to be in a state of salvation.[39]

St. Paul did not make this distinction because in the early Church it was not very noticeable; it was only the passing years and the malice of men which brought out the lack of identity between the visible and the invisible Church:

> It is only too obvious that, owing to the inevitable misuse of free will, the visible Church is not co-extensive with the invisible Church on earth; that it does not perfectly embody that Church on the earthly plane.

---

[37] *Ibid.,* 177.

[38] *Loc. cit.*

[39] *Loc. cit.*

> Within the visible body there are numbers of dead cells —still, however, externally joined to the body, and therefore in a peculiarly advantageous position for the reanimation by the Spirit-soul. Of the living cells the animation is for the most part very imperfect. The life of these cells is often not actuated by the Spirit beyond the minimal degree that keeps them from spiritual death. These facts, in turn, prevent the visible Church from appearing to the eyes of many as that visible temple of the Spirit, that obvious continuation of the personal Christ, animated in all its acts by His dispositions, which it would be, were the divine plan fully carried out. Hence vast numbers of Christ-loving souls fail to recognize the Church as His bride and His body, though prepared to join her at all cost, did they but recognize her as such. In face of these facts theology has been obliged to develop explicitly the distinction between the soul of the Church—the invisible Church-body of all souls who share in the supernatural life—and the body of the Church—the visible Church Catholic and Roman.[40]

This lack of identity between the soul and the body of the Church is due to sin; the sin of those who culpably are hostile to the Church, but also to the sin of Catholics. And this difference between the soul and the body makes it possible for men to be members of the Mystical Body without being members of the body of the Church:

> In the Apostolic age the Church-body of Christ was relatively healthy. Hence the lack of harmony and of adequate expression between the visible body and the soul, was not conspicuous. About the time of the Greek schism, and again at the dawn of the Reformation, the condition of the Church was as unhealthy, we hope, as it is possible for it to be. Hence the growth of Christian bodies external to the one visible body of Christ, whose individual members are nevertheless incorporated into the mystical body of Christ by their inclusion in the soul of the Church.[41]

Thus we have in effect two bodies the invisible Church composed of souls sharing the supernatural life and the visible Church, the Roman Catholic Church. They are not co-extensive; the first contains all those who are members of the Mystical Body of Christ; the same may not be said of the second, although it remains "the one *corporate* embodiment of the invisible [Church]."[42] This concept of the body and the soul of the Church is summarized by the author himself:

---

[40] *Ibid.*, 178.

[41] *Ibid.*, 179.

> This doctrine of the soul and the body of the Church and of their mutual relation, as it is taught in Catholic theology, saves us from the two opposed extremes of spirit-denying exclusiveness and undenominational indifferentism. We can recognize that, because the sin, both social and individual, of Catholics has prevented and does still prevent the visible Church from being the adequate home and vehicle of the invisible on earth, the action of the Spirit may be found even outside her bounds; and that the soul of the Church is therefore more extensive than the body. Nor shall we presume to limit the possible intensity of the Spirit in individual souls outside the Church. We, shall, moreover realize that as the body exists for the soul and not vice versa, the visible Church is secondary, not primary; the means, not the end. It is the invisible Church for whose sake the visible exists. It is therefore only the invisible Church whose membership is absolutely and without qualification necessary, since incorporation into the invisible Church is one and the same thing as supernatural union with God. At the same time we shall recognize that the ideal, the divine plan, is that the visible Church shall be coterminous with the invisible on earth, its adequate embodiment; and that therefore, it is the goal for which we should strive.[43]

In such a view the importance of the visible Church is certainly greatly reduced. Nevertheless Watkin does predicate some necessity of that institution: "It will also be evident that the visible Church is of necessity the one corporate embodiment of the invisible. No one therefore is free to remain for any reason whatsoever outside the visible body; for he is bound to fulfill the divine plan as far as he knows it, and to the utmost of his power."[44]

---

[42] *Ibid.,* 181.

[43] *Ibid.,* 180-181.

In one line only Watkin mentions that it is the presence of an implicit desire which makes possible the salvation of non-Catholics. Then at length he describes the body-soul dichotomy, making it into a distinction of visible and invisible Church. By far the most appealing as well as the most important is the invisible Church. Such a distinction does extreme violence to the Catholic concept of Church. For there are not two Churches, one visible, one invisible, both having unequal extensions. There is no society such as that described; composed of all those united with Christ through grace. Finally, the Catholic Church fares rather badly as if it were an extremely poor representation of the followers of Christ; the more faithful and more ardent followers of Our Lord being found among those who are not numbered as members of the Catholic Church. In such a view it is the soul of the Church which is the true body of Christ and it is membership in this invisible Church which is necessary for salvation. The mere exposition of this view shows that it is simply a denial of the traditional explanation of the Church's necessity.

In a *Manuel d'apologétique* published in 1920, Boulenger commends the theologians of the 19th century for justly and brilliantly distinguishing between the two meanings of the necessity of the Church: "One group distinguishes real belonging to the Church (*in re*) and belonging to the Church in desire (*in voto*). . . . Another group distinguishes between the soul and the body of the Church, saying there is a necessity of means for belonging to the soul of the Church and a necessity of precept for belonging to its body."[45] Both of these are acceptable and conformable to the teaching of Pius IX: "Let us add finally, that these two interpretations of the Catholic dogma are conformable to the teaching of Pius IX in his consistorial allocution *Singulari quadam* of Dec.

---

[44] *Loc. cit.*

[45] "Les une distinguent d'appartenance réelle (in re) et l'appartenance de désir (in voto). . . . Les autres distinguant entre l'âme et corps de l'Église, disent qu'il est de necessité d'appartenir à l'âme de l'Église, et de necessité de precepte d'appartenir à son corps." A. Boulenger, *Manuel d'Apologetique* (Paris 1920) 388.

9, 1854, and in his encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerere. . . .*"[46] He concludes by saying that the true meaning of the axiom is contained in the statement: "There is no salvation for those voluntarily outside the body of the Church."[47]

In its issue of June 28, 1923, *L'Ami du clergé* printed a rather long answer to a question concerning the axiom of the Church's necessity for salvation. The question ran: "Is there not such a necessary union between the body and soul of the Church that we must apply to the social-religious Organism this law of the human composite: 'The soul is so joined to the body that nothing can be vivified by the soul unless it first becomes part of the body?' How then are we to understand the axiom 'Outside the Church no salvation?' "[48] The answer to this question is over nine pages long and represents a detailed summation of the theological teaching concerning this question. In the first section the author is firm in stating that a person cannot partake of the benefits of the soul of the Church unless he also is joined to the body. He says: "Thus the life of grace—the soul of the Church—requires necessarily and as an indispensable complement, the visible, exterior Organism of the body of the Church."[49] They are inseparable and cannot be separated merely for the purpose of providing a convenient solution to the problems posed by the axiom. Two explanations are then rejected as unsuitable: that it suffices to belong to the soul of the Church; that it is necessary with the necessity of means to belong to the soul of the Church and necessary with the necessity of precept to belong to the body. In conclusion the article proposes the *in re-in voto* explanation: "We must say then that it is necessary to belong to the (visible) Church in order to be saved; but it is not necessary to belong to it in fact, really; it suffices to belong to it by desire, at heart."[50]

---

[46] "Ajoutons, pour terminer, que ces deux interpretations du dogme catholiques sont conformés a l'enseignement de Pie IX dans son allocution consistoriale *Singulari quadem* du 9 decembre 1854 et dans son encyclique Quanto conficiamur moerere. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

[47] "Hors du corps de l'Église volontairement, pas de salut." *Ibid.,* 389.

[48] "N'y a-t-il pas, entre le corps et l'âme de l'Église une union si necessaire que l'on doive appliquer à l'Organisme social religieux cette loi du composé humain: 'Anima ita conjungitur corpori ut nihil ab anima vivificari potest nisi prius pars corporis fit?' Comment alors comprendre l'axiome: 'Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.' " *L'Ami du Clergé,* vol. 40, n. 26 (June 28, 1923), 405.

[49] "Ainsi la vie de la grâce,—âme de l'Eglise—appelle necessairement et comme un complement indispensable l'Organisme visible et extérieur du corps de l'Église." *Loc. cit.*

In another small work in 1924, Duplessy uses the *in re-in voto* explanation: "Certainly, to attain salvation, a person must belong to the Church. But there are two ways of belonging to it: in *fact* or in *desire;* or if you prefer, *visibly* or *invisibly.*"[51]

Brunsmann in 1924 considers the question of the necessity of the Church against the background of membership. Discussing the concept of necessity of means he distinguishes between internal and external necessity. In regard to external necessity, since it is based upon divine positive law, Providence has provided a substitute for those who cannot keep the law due to ignorance or impossibility: "In every such case the ordinary or normal means is said to be relatively necessary (*necessitas medii relative*). It is and remains the only ordinary means, but in exceptional cases, when it is impossible to employ it, the goal can be reached by using the substitute offered."[52] Membership in the Church is necessary with this relative necessity of means. When actual membership is impossible, the substitute which is offered is union with the Church in desire (*coniunctio in voto*). This desire may be either implicit or explicit. In two propositions, Brunsmann expresses the total necessity involved: "1. Membership in the Church of Christ is necessary for all men by divine command (*necessitate praecepti*)." . . . "We further hold that membership in the Church of Christ is a means of salvation relatively necessary for all men (*necessitate medii relativa*)."[53] In clarifying this second principle, the author repeats his teaching concerning union with the Church in desire and then he introduces *ex abrupto* the body-soul distinction: "Where union with the external organization or body of the Church is impossible, it suffices to belong to the soul of the Church, that is, to participate in the life of grace that flows from Christ as head into the members of His Mystical Body."[54] Concerning the axiom, Brunsmann distinguishes between the historical and the theological meaning. The former is simply that those culpably outside the Church cannot be saved; the latter meaning is that unless a man *somehow* belongs to the Church of Christ, that is, unless he is at least implicitly, i.e. by desire, united with her "external organism" he cannot be saved.[55]

---

[50] "On dit donc qu'il est necessaire d'appartenir à l'Église (visible) pour être sauvé; mais qu'il n'est pas necessaire de lui appartenir en fait, *re;* il suffit qu'on lui appartienne de désir, par le coeur, *voto." Ibid.,* 412.

[51] "Certes, pour être sauvé, il est indispensable d'appartenir à l'Église. Mais il y a deux manières de lui appartenir: en *fait* ou en *voeu*—ou, si on préfere, *visiblement* ou *invisiblement.* E. Duplessy, *La Constitution de l'eglise"* (Paris 1924) 13.

[52] J. Brunsmann, *A Handbook of Fundamental Theology,* ed. by A. Preuss (St. Louis 1931) 3.314.

[53] *Ibid.,* 318, 322.

J. V. Bainvel, in his *De ecclesia* published in 1925, contents himself with rejecting the body-soul explanation and stating that a man will not be saved unless he belongs "to the body of the Church either really or in desire."[56] Dieckmann in the same year very briefly exposes the *in re-in voto* explanation.[57] In the 1925 edition of Herrman's *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* it is stated that: "Real union with the Church is necessary for all men in order to attain salvation; it is necessary with both the necessity of precept and the relative necessity of means."[58] The necessity of means is relative since it may be supplied for by a desire: "Where, *per accidens,* real subjective observance is impossible, there may be present at least a sincere will (i.e. a *votum* explicit where possible, or at least implicit) of observing [God's] mandates."[59] Thus this edition omits the mention of the body-soul explanation which was present in the first edition of 1897. However in this later edition necessity of means is still defined as that "whereby the

---

[54] *Ibid.,* 325.

[55] *Ibid.,* 328-329.

[56] See J. V. Bainvel, *De ecclesia Christi* (Paris 1925) 89.

[57] See H. Dieckmann, *Tractatus historico-dogmatici de ecclesia* (Freiburg i. Br. 1925) 2.251.

[58] "Realis adjunctio ad Ecclesiam omnibus hominibus necessaria pro aeterna consequenda salute, necessitate praecepti, immo etiam necessitate relative medii." J. Herrmann, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* (7 ed. Lyons 1937) 1.372.

[59] "Ubi ergo per accidens, realis observantia subjective impossibilis evadit, adsit saltem sincera voluntas (i.e. votum, sive explicitum, ubi possibile, sive saltem implicitum) servandi mandata." *Ibid.,* 375.

Church is the only ordinary means of salvation." And in this edition it is made clear that God by an extraordinary providence can care for those who are inculpably outside the Church.[60] So while there have been changes made since 1897, many former elements still remain so that the treatment is a mixture of old discarded elements and new views. The statement regarding the extraordinary providence of God has obviously been taken from Bainvel; the understanding of the axiom as referring only to those culpably outside the Church[61] appeared in the 1897 edition. This eclectic procedure has resulted in an explanation composed of loosely-connected and sometimes divergent elements.

Schultes, in 1925, sees a necessity of "pertaining to the body of the visible Church."[62] This necessity is one of both precept and means: "The Church is a society that is necessary with the necessity of precept. . . . The Church is a society that is necessary with the necessity of means, i.e. from the institution and will of Christ, the visible Church is a means that is necessary to attain salvation. This necessity is such that a man may adhere to the Church either really or at least by desire."[63] However this *votum* is not viewed as another manner of using the one means of salvation but rather as a disposition which merits for the person the special aid of God. For the Church is only the ordinary means of salvation. There are other means for people who are prevented from using this means:

> The visible Church is the ordinary means of sanctifying and saving men. The meaning is that according to the divine ordination and the law of the order of grace, the Church has been instituted so that men may receive through it and under its direction, the true faith, remission of sins, grace (through the sacraments), and efficacious direction for the exercise of virtues. However

---

[60] See *ibid.*, p. 377.

[61] See J. Herrmann, *Institutiones* (Lyons 1897) 280.

[62] ". . . pertinendi ad corpus Ecclesiae visibilis." R. Schultes, *De ecclesia catholica* (Paris 1931) 265.

[63] "Ecclesia est societas necessaria necessitate praecepti. . . . Ecclesia est societas necessaria necessitate medii, i.e. ex institutione et voluntate Christi Ecclesia visibilis est medium necessarium ad salutem consequendam: ita tamen ut quisquis ipsi adhaerat sive re sive saltem voto." *Ibid.*, 267-268.

> the extraordinary means of salvation is the immediate sanctifying operation of God.[64]

So the *votum* of Schultes seems to be slightly different from the common understanding of it which we have encountered so often. In 1926 Joseph de Guibert writes: "Outside the Church, the body of the One Mediator, there is no salvation; therefore for every man it is necessary with the necessity of means that he become a member of the Church really, or at least in desire."[65] He gives an explanation of the terms necessity of means and precept stressing that the former indicates a necessary causal influence which must be exercised else salvation is impossible. This causal influence can be exercised in certain cases by desire: "a desire of entering the Church suffices, where real entry cannot be had."[66]

2. KARL ADAM

During the summer of 1923 at the University of Tübingen, Karl Adam delivered several lectures to an audience of mixed religious beliefs. These lectures were later published in book form under the title *Das Wesen des Katholizismus.* In one of these lectures which later became a chapter in the book, Adam spoke of the "Church Necessary for Salvation." He contended that the declaration of the Church's necessity was not directed against persons, but against non-Catholic communions and only a particular portion of those communions:

> To begin with, it is certain that the declaration that there is no salvation outside the Church is not aimed at

---

[64] "Ecclesia visibilis est medium ordinarium sanctificandi et salvandi homines. Sensus est: secundum ordinationem divinam et legem ordinis gratiae, Ecclesia est instituta ut homines per illam et sub eius directione veram fidem accipiant et remissionem peccatorum et gratiam (per sacramenta) et directionem efficacem ad exercitium virtutum. Medium vere extraordinarium salutis est immediate operatio sanctifica Dei." *Ibid.,* 272.

[65] "Extra Ecclesiam, unici Mediatoris corpus, non est salus; singulis igitur hominibus necessarium est necessitate medii ut membra visibilis Ecclesiae fiant re, aut saltem in voto." J. de Guibert, *De Christi ecclesia* (Rome 1928) 155.

[66] "Sufficit votum ingrediendi Ecclesiam, ubi res haberi nequit." *Ibid.,* 158.

> individual non-Catholics, at any person as persons, but at non-Catholic churches and communions, in so far as they are non-Catholic communions. Its purpose is to formulate positively the truth that there is but one Body of Christ and therefore but one Church which possesses and imparts the grace of Christ in its fullness.[67]

The last three words of the quotation are important. For Adam maintains that the Catholic Church possesses the grace of Christ *in its fullness* whereas the other Christian bodies possess and impart only a portion of that grace, depending on the amount of Catholic truth that the particular communion may still possess. Thus non-Catholic communions are composed of non-Catholic and Catholic parts, and the doctrine of the Church's necessity is aimed merely at the non-Catholic parts, since the Catholic parts can still be operative and still lead a person to Christ:

> For non-Catholic communions are not merely non-Catholic and anti-Catholic. When they set themselves up against the original Church of Christ, they took over and maintained a considerable amount of Catholic inheritance, and also certain Catholic means of grace, in particular the sacrament of Baptism. They are therefore, if we regard them as a whole, not mere antithesis and negation, but also to a large extent thesis and affirmation of the ancient treasure of truth and grace that has come down to us from Christ and the apostles. Their Churches are built not only of their own un-Catholic materials, but also of Catholic stuff from the original store of salvation. And in so far as they are genuinely Catholic in their faith and worship, it can and will and must happen that there should be, even outside the visible Church, a real growth and progress in union with Christ.[68]

---

[67] "In erster Linie steht fest: der Satz von der Heilsnotwendigkeit der Kirche richtet seine ursprüngliche Spitze nicht gegen den einzelnen Nichtkatholiken, gegen irgendeine Person als Person, sondern gegen nichtkatholische Kirchen und Gemeinschaften, insofern sie Gemeinschaften sind. Er will in positiver Wendung die Wahrheit sichern: es gibt nur einen Leib Christie und darum nur eine Kirche, welche die Segensfülle Christi birgt und mitteilt." K. Adam, *Das Wesen Des Katholizismus* (7 ed. Dusseldorf 1934) 205.

[68] "Die akatholischen Gemeinschaften sind nicht blos unkatholisch und antikatholisch. Als sie sich gegen die ursprüngliche Christuskirche aufrichteten, übernahmen und behielten sie einen beträchtlichen Teil des katho-

These "Catholic" things scattered as they are outside the visible Church include valid sacraments. Now since these "Catholic" things effect so much in leading a man to Christ, it is evident that the activity of God's grace is not bound to the visible limits of the Roman Catholic Church.[69]

Therefore, according to Karl Adam, when we come to fathom the true meaning of the axiom *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus,* we must keep these two points in mind; for they shed the proper light on the axiom and enable us to understand it correctly. It means simply that the Catholic Church is the ordinary means of salvation. She is "in the economy of salvation the ordinary proper institute of the truth and grace of Jesus on the earth."[70] Adam develops this thought at length:

> But that does not prevent there being, alongside this ordinary institute, extra-ordinary ways of salvation; nor does it hinder the grace of Christ from visiting particular men without the mediation of the Church. But because and in so far as the Body of Christ comprehends all those who are saved by Christ those also who are visited by His grace in this immediate way belong to His Church. It is true that they do not belong to its outward and visible body, but they certainly belong to its invisible, supernatural soul, to its supernatural substance.

---

lischen Glaubenssehatzes wie auch diese und jene Gnadenmittel, vor allem das Sakrament der Taufe. Sie sind also, in ihrer Ganzheit gesehen, nicht blos Gegensatz und Verneinung, sondern zu einem guten Teil auch Bejahung des alten, von Christus und den Aposteln übernommenen Erves an Wahrheit und Gnade. Sie haben sich neben ihrer unkatholischen Eigenart urkatholisches Heilsgut eingebaut. Und insofern und insoweit, als sie in Glaube und Kult wahrhaft katholische sind, kann und wird und mus es geschehen, das auch auserhalb der sichtbaren Kirche ein wahres, übernatürliches Leben, ein Emporwachsen und Hineinwachsen in die Gemeinschaft mit Christus feststellbar ist." *Ibid.,* 206.

[69] "So schroff und entschieden die Kirche ihren Anspruch, der eigentliche und einzige Leib Christi zu sein, aufrechterhält und immer wieder betont, so greszügig und frei urteilt sie über das Gnadenwirken Christi. Es ist schlechthin ohne Enden und Grenzen, es ist unendlich wie das Herz Gottes selbst." *Ibid.,* 210-211.

[70] "Die Kirche versteht diesen Anspruch dahin, das sie kraft der ansdrücklichen Stiftung Christi im Heilsplan Gottes die ordentliche eigentliche Anstalt der Wahrheit und Gnade Jesu auf Erden ist." *Ibid.,* 211.

> For the grace of Christ never works in the individual in an isolated fashion, but always in and through the unity of His Body. And thus it holds good, even for those brethren who are thus separated from the visible organism of the Church, that they too are saved through the Church, and not without her or in opposition to her.[71]

This constitutes a rather wide explanation of the doctrine and Adam recognizes that several objections could be posed: "But it may be objected, how can there be true Christians who belong to the soul of the Church and yet are separated from her visible body?"[72] To provide answers to these objections, we must pass from the theological to the psychological order:

> In supplying a brief answer to this question, we shall pass from the theological to the psychological explanation of the dogma under discussion. From the purely theological standpoint, in the light of the dogmatic idea of the intimate and necessary connection between Christ and the Church, the only possible conclusion regarding all heretics and schismatics, Jews and pagans, is that judgment of condemnation which the Council of Florence pronounced upon them. In so far as they stand, and will to stand, outside the one Church of Christ, they stand according to strict theology outside the sphere of Christ's grace and therefore outside salvation. It is thus, from this purely theological standpoint, that we are to under-

---

[71] "Das schliest nicht aus, das es neben diester ordentlichen Heilsanstalt auserordentliche Heilswege gibt, das Christi Gnade diesen und jenen Menschen ohne kirchliche Vermittlung unmittelbar heimsucht. Aber auch alle diese von der Gnade Jesu unmittelbar Berührten gehören zur Kirche, weil und insofern diese als Leib Christi die übergreifende Einheit aller in Christus Erlösten ist. Sie gehören nicht zwar zu ihrem äuseren, sichtbaren Leib, wohl aber zu ihrer geistigen, unsichtbaren Seele, zu ihrem übernaturlichen Wesenkern. Denn die Gnade Christi wirkt niemals für sich allein in diesem und jenem. Sie wirkt stets in Verbundenheit mit Seinem Leib, . . . In diesem Sinn gilt auch für die vom äuseren Organismus der Kirche getrennten Brüder, das sie nicht ohne und gegen die Kirche Christi, sondern nur inihr selig werden." *Ibid.,* 211-212.

[72] "Aber wie es denkbar, das es wahre Christen gibt, die zur Seele der Kirche gehören, aber dennoch von ohrem sichtbaren Leib getrennt sind? Wie kann es sein, das man dem Leib Christi angehört und doch nict dem Leib der Kirche?" *Ibid.,* 212.

> stand the sharp anathemas pronounced by the Church against all heretics and schismatics.[73]

In these pronouncements the Church is not considering individuals as individuals, but regarding them as representatives of ideas antagonistic to the Church. When ideas are in conflict, when truth is fighting against error, and revelation against human ingenuity, then there can be no compromise and no indulgence. But in passing to the psychological order, the theologian becomes a pastor of souls and thus the Church has come to establish the distinction between material and formal heretics:

> Bus as soon as it is a question, not of the conflict between idea and idea, but of living men, of our judgment on this or that non-Catholic, then the theologian becomes a psychologist, the dogmatist a pastor of souls. He draws attention to the fact that the living man is very rarely the embodiment of an idea, that the conceptual world and mentality of the individual are so multifarious and complicated, that he cannot be reduced to a single formula. In other words the heretic, the Jew and the pagan seldom exist in a pure state. What we actually have before us is living men, with their fundamental outlook influenced or dominated by this or that erroneous idea. Therefore the Church expressly distinguishes between "formal" and "material" heretics.[74]

---

[73] "Indem wir diese Frage kurz beantworten, gehen wir von der theologischen zur psychologischen Beluchtung unseres Dogmas über. Vom rein theologischen Gesichtspunkt aus, im Licht der Glaubenswahrheit vom inneren Wesenszusammenhang zwischen Christus und der Kirche, kann es für alle Häretiker und Schismatiker, für alle Juden und Heiden nur jenes Verwerfungsurteil geben, welches das Konzil von Florenz über sie ausgesprochen hat. Insofern sie auserhalb der einen Kirche Christi sind und sein wollen, stehen sie hach dem strengen Sinngehalt des Dogmas auserhalb der Gnadensphäre Christi und auserhalb des Heils. Von diesem rein dogmatischen Standpunkt aus sind die scharfen Verwerfungsurteile der Kirche gegen alle Häretiker und Schismatiker zu verstehen. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

[74] "In dem Augenblick aber, wo nicht Ideen gegen Ideen auszutragen sind, wo es sich um lebendige Menschen handelt, um die Beurteilung dieses und jenes Andersgläubigen, da wird der Theologe zum Psychologen, der Dogmatiker zum Seelsorger. Er macht darauf aufmerksam, das der lebendige Mensch nur äuserst selten der lebendige Ausdruck einer Idee ist, das das Vorstellungsnetz des lebendigen Menschen und seine Geistigkeit derart

This distinction confirms the Church's constant belief in the possibility of invincible error and perfect good faith in the heretic. It is this concept alone which places the doctrine in the proper perspective:

> Unless we understand that, we shall not grasp the meaning of her proposition, that there is no salvation outside the Church. True there is only one Church of Christ. She alone is the Body of Christ and without her there is no salvation. Objectively and practically considered she is the ordinary way of salvation, the single and exclusive channel by which the truth and grace of Christ enter our world of space and time. But those also who know her not receive these gifts from her; yes, even those who misjudge and fight against her, provided they are in good faith and are simply and loyally seeking the truth without self-righteous obstinancy. Though it be not the Catholic Church itself which hands them the bread of truth and grace, yet it is Catholic bread that they eat. And, while they eat of it, they are, without knowing it or willing it, incorporated in the supernatural substance of the Church. Though they be outwardly separated from the Church, they belong to its soul.[75]

To sum up then, Adam views the Church as the ordinary way

---

verästelt und verwickelt ist, das man sein Wesen nicht auf eine einfache, reinliche Formel bringen kann. Mit andern Worten: der Ketzer, der Jude, der Heide im dogmatischen Vollsinnexistiert nicht allzu häufig. Es existieren gemeinhin nur lebendige Menschen, deren Grundhaltung in diesem und jenem von abwegigen Ideen beeinflust oder beherrscht ist. Darum unterscheidet die Kirche ausdrücklich zwischen 'formellen' und 'materiellen' Haeretikern." *Ibid.,* 213-214.

[75] "Von da aus gewinnt der kirchliche Haupstatz: auserhalb der Kirche kein Heil, erst sein entscheidendes Verständnis. Wohl gibt est nur eine Kirche Christi. Sie allein ist Christi Leib, und ohne sie gibt es kein Heil. Sie ist in objektivem, schlichem Betracht der ordentliche Heilsweg die einzige ausschliesliche Lichtquelle, durch die alle Wahrheit und Gnade Christi in die raumzeitliche. Welt einströmt. Aber von dieser Lichtquelle empfangen in einem tiefen, wahren Sinn auch die, welche sie nich kennen; ja, die sie verkennen und bekämpfen, wenn anders sie nur guten Willens sind und bleiben, wenn sie ihne selbstgerechte Eigenwilligkeit schlicht und treu hach der Wahrheit suchen. Reicht ihnen das Brot der Wahrheit und Gnade auch nicht die katholische Kirche selbst, es ist doch katholisches Brot, das sie essen. Und indem sie davon essen, werden sie, ohne das sie es wissen

of salvation. There are, alongside this means, extraordinary ways of salvation through which men can be saved. People saved in this way are said to pertain to the soul of the Church since "the Body of Christ comprehends all those who are saved by Christ." For these people, union with the Church is something that is consequent upon the attainment of salvation; it is not an indispensable *means* of salvation, as Adam makes clear in stating that these people attain salvation "without the mediation of the Church."

These views of the doctrine have been expressed before. What is most original in the explanation of Adam is the fact that he assigns to the "Catholic" element present in non-Catholic religions an active casual role in the process of salvation. The Catholic Church, he claims, represents the fullness of the elements of salvation; separated elements are scattered throughout all religions which have preserved some Catholic elements. However it seems inaccurate to picture the Catholic Church as having and imparting the fullness of the grace of Christ, whereas the other Christian communions have and impart this grace in varying degrees. The Catholic faith is an indivisible unity. As Pope Benedict XV has stated: "It is of the nature of the Catholic faith that nothing can be added to it, nothing taken away; it is either accepted in full or rejected in full."[76] It must not then be represented as something that can be divided and still possess degrees of efficiency. Furthermore it is the visible Church itself which is necessary for salvation, not a portion of the Church separated from the main structure. This is clear from the statements of Pope Pius IX.[77]

Again, it seems that all that is required to benefit from the use of these elements is "good faith" or "good will"; yet neither of these, according to Adam, establishes union with the Church. On the contrary it is clear that this union *results* from the beneficial use of these elements; union with the Church is not here regarded as a necessary prerequisite for salvation. Whenever people are

---

oder wollen, dem übernatürlichen Wesenskern der Kirche eingefügt. Sie gehören ihrer Seele an, mögen sie auch äuserlich von ihr getrennt sein." *Ibid.*, 217-218.

[76] Encyclical *Ad beatissimi.* The citation is from the English translation appearing in *AAS.* VI (1914) 656.

[77] See above, 19 ff.

saved by these scattered Catholic elements they are, as a result, attached to the soul of the Church. And it is this fact which makes the statement "outside the Church no salvation," true. This explanation of Adam differs markedly from the assertion that all salvation must come *in Ecclesia* and per *Ecclesiam.* Union with the Church which *results from* salvation and union with the Church which is an absolutely necessary *means* and *cause* of salvation, are not identical concepts. Caperan was emphatic in stating that a man was not saved because of the false religion he professed, but in spite of it. Adam is just as emphatic in stating that a man is saved because of and through the false religion; not of course the religion taken as a whole, but those elements of the religion which are "Catholic." Adam's view seems to remove much of the necessity of union with the Church; especially since he does not require the *votum ecclesiae* to render the use of these elements salvific; on the contrary he views union with the Church as resulting from the influence of these elements.

Finally, the twofold consideration of the axiom first on the dogmatic then on the psychological plane has serious defects. Dogmatically considered, Adam states, the axiom is merely the objective statement of the truth of the Catholic religion and the essential falseness of all other religions. But is this actually the case? *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* would seem to be a strange formula for the expression of such a teaching. The intent of the axiom certainly seems to be to state clearly that no man may attain salvation except in and through the Roman Catholic Church. Such has been the Church's own understanding of this doctrine traditionally. If there is to be any meaning to this axiom, it must be directed toward every single member of the human race, even at "individuals as individuals." If there is any man who finds himself outside the Church, he cannot be saved. The key to the understanding of this teaching lies in a comprehension of the phrase "outside the Church"; and not in predicating the axiom of individuals only in so far as they are "representatives of idea antagonistic to the Church." This interpretation does not fulfill the exigencies of the historical meaning and the obvious dogmatic content of the axiom.

Adam's psychological explanation is concerned with "living men, of our judgment of this or that non-Catholic. . . ." But constant in the Catholic explanation of this doctrine is the statement that we make no judgment of individuals. We merely establish on the basis of known revelation what must objectively be the conditions under which salvation is gained; as to who does or who does not fulfill these conditions, no human is permitted to judge. Thus Adam's division into a theological and a psychological explanation does not carry us closer to a complete understanding of the doctrine. It culminates merely in a dry theological statement that the Church is the one true Church; a statement which has no subjective application; and in a psychological consideration regarding the status of individual souls.

Adam's view was to prove very popular. It gained acceptance even though it represents a sharp departure from the traditional approach and is, in part, a return to the simple body-soul explanation which has been set aside as unacceptable by the majority of competent theologians. The Church is regarded as merely the ordinary way of salvation, not the exclusive way. Non-Catholic religions are given some role in the process of salvation. These limitations of the doctrine, made by Adam, do not portray the Church as an absolutely necessary means of salvation.

3. SUMMARY

In this period, the utilization of the *in re-in voto* explanation became almost universal. It was employed by all the authors examined except Sertillanges, Verhelst, Watkin, and Adam. Some authors were still using this explanation in conjunction with others; while with all, the nature of the *votum* received closer consideration. Muncunill, Prunel and Boulenger used this explanation together with the body-soul distinction. Muncunill merely mentioned the latter; Prunel and Boulenger regard both explanations as acceptable, though Prunel voiced a preference for the former.

Dorsch, D'Herbigny, Bainvel, Dieckmann, de Guibert, the article in *L'ami du clergé,* as well as the lesser works of Walker, Duplessy, Cristiani all built a firm explanation upon the *in re-in voto* explanation. Hervé added the distinction of E. Hugon; Felder gave the *in re-in voto* explanation but understood the *votum* as uniting the person to the soul of the Church. Herrman and Brunsmann viewed membership as a relative necessity of means which in certain cases can be substituted for by the desire of becoming a member. Schultes understood the *votum* not as uniting a person to the one means of salvation (the Church) but as a disposition which merits for the person the special aid of God. Thus the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation.

The explanations of Sertillanges, Verhelst, Watkin and Adam all represent a radical departure from the traditional view. Sertillanges changed the signification of the term "Church" in the axiom; for him it meant ". . . the society of those who are governed by the law of mankind." His explanation left little necessity to the Church beyond necessity of precept. Verhelst understood the doctrine as postulating only the necessity of actual adherence to the visible Church; in the light of such an understanding, he logically concluded that this necessity cannot be universal, but only particular. Therefore he denied both the body-soul and *in re-in voto* explanations and held merely for the necessity of precept. Watkin described two churches, one visible, the other invisible. The latter appeared to be the more necessary and the influence of the Roman Catholic Church was not described in very appealing terms. Adam saw union with the Church in desire as an effect rather than a cause of salvation. He predicated of the Catholic elements in non-Catholic religions some causality in the procurement of salvation. His theological explanation equated the doctrine with the statement that the Church is the one true Church; his psychological explanation applied the doctrine only to those who are formal heretics. In fine, Adam painted the Church as merely the ordinary way of salvation; salvation can and does come without the mediation of the Church; and in such cases the most important role is played by the Catholic elements which are present in non-Catholic religions.

The acceptance then of the *in re-in voto* explanation has become almost universal among the standard theologians of the Church. It is still sometimes used with elements of the body-soul explanation. Yet alongside this continued development, there is the phenomenon of four independent works, of accepted and even highly regarded theologians, which depart from the traditional exposition of the doctrine.

CHAPTER VII

FROM ADAM TO CONGAR

1. AUTHORS FROM ADAM TO CONGAR

The period between the two great wars saw great activity in the field of ecclesiology. The doctrine to which theologians most energetically directed their attention was the doctrine of the Mystical Body; in particular the relationship between the Mystical Body and the Roman Catholic Church. This vigorous activity did not always consider directly the doctrine of the Church's necessity; nevertheless this period is one of great importance in the modern history of that doctrine. Some theologians, feeling that their predecessors had over-emphasized the importance of the exterior, juridical aspect of the Church, fell into the opposite error of attaching more importance to union with the invisible aspect of the Church and to the community of life between Christ and Christians, much to the detriment of the visible aspect and hierarchic element of the Church. "Certain of them even sketched a theology of the Mystical Body *alongside* the theology of the Church. As if, besides the visible Church of the Creed, one holy, catholic and apostolic, centralized around the infallible primacy of the Pope, there was another invisible Church embracing all men of good will united mysteriously by grace to the heavenly Christ."[1] Such a viewpoint would see little necessity for belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. However in the theology of time, there was no lack of theologians who steadily developed a clear theology of the Mystical Body and who presented with ever-growing clarity the traditional understanding of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. A realization of the presence of these two theological trends will explain the marked divergence evident between some of the explanations of the period.

---

[1] ". . . on voyait même certains d'entre eux esquisser une théologie du Corps Mystique *à coté* de la théologie de l'Église. Comme si, à coté de l'Eglise visible du Credo, une, sainte, catholique et apostolique, centralisée autour du primat infallible du pape, il y a un autre Église invisible englobant tous les hommes de bonne volonté unis mystérieusement par la grâce au Christ celeste." R. Aubert, *La théologie catholique au milieu du xx^e siècle* (Paris 1954) 89.

In 1927 Sylvester Berry, professor of Apologetics at Mount Saint Mary's seminary in Emmitsburg, Md., phrased his thesis thus: "Membership in the Church is necessary both by necessity of means and necessity of precept."[2] Speaking of the necessity of means he says: "Christ commands all men to belong to the Church because it is the means which He established for salvation."[3] After quoting from the *Singulari quadam* and the *Quanto conficiamur moerere,* he states: "These facts prove that membership in the Church is a relative necessity, i.e., if actual membership is impossible for any reason, other means are available to supply the deficiency."[4] He then rejects the explanation that would hold that membership in the soul of the Church is necessary by absolute necessity but membership in the body merely by necessity of precept. He observes: "The Church herself never makes this distinction between body and soul, when there is question of membership in her fold, and it has already been noted that a person cannot belong to the soul of the Church unless he also belongs to her body."[5] Since this necessity of membership is relative, if actual membership is impossible "it can be supplied by perfect contrition, or perfect love of God, with the desire to belong to the true Church of Christ."[6] In the same year, Paul Lahargou, in two works, uses the body-soul explanation. In *Nouveau cours d'apologétique,* he devotes a section to the explanation of the axiom and defends it against the charge of intolerance. Sanctifying grace is that which brings life into the Church and it can be possessed without belonging to the body of the Church: "Whoever is in the state of grace lives the life of the Church; he is vivified by its vital principle and belongs to the soul of the Church. This can be the case with very many schismatics, heretics, and pagans. . . ."[7] In *L'église et se temoins dans le monde,* he is also clear in stating that a person can belong to the soul of the Church but not to the body: "It can happen that a person may belong to the body of the Church without belonging to its soul, and that he belong to its soul without belonging to its body."[8] This axiom is true because there is no salvation without belonging to the soul of the Church: "They are saved, not outside the Church, but in the Church; in the soul of the Church to which they belong by the supernatural life which they have led."[9] The last author to be considered in this year is L. Lercher. Thesis 40 in the first volume of his *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* reads: "The Church is necessary with the necessity of means for all men in order that they might obtain salvation."[10] This necessity may be satisfied in some cases by the presence of a desire; however this does not constitute another way of salvation, but merely another use of the one necessary means: "Real use of the external means and a desire of this same means are not two distinct means, but are related to one another as an object to its substitute. Therefore God accepts, in place of the means itself, only that desire, which by its nature, efficaciously moves a man to utilize that means, when it becomes known to him and when an opportunity of using it presents itself."[11] Lercher mentions the explanation which maintains that a man may be saved by belonging only to the soul of the Church. This explanation, he states, has several drawbacks; the principal one being that it leads ultimately to the delineation of two Churches, one visible and one invisible. To remove this danger he notes that the soul of the Church is the Holy Spirit and that though the Holy Spirit can influence those who are not members of the Church, He sanctifies no one who is not related to the Church at least in desire.[12]

---

[2] S. Berry, *The Church of Christ* (St. Louis 1927) 236.

[3] *Ibid.,* 240.

[4] *Ibid.,* 240-241.

[5] *Loc. cit.*

[6] *Ibid.,* 242.

---

[7] "Quiconque est en état de grâce vit de la vie de l'Église, donc est animé de son principe vital et appartent à l'âme de l'Église. Ceci peut être le cas de beaucoup de schismatiques, de beaucoup d'hérétiques, beaucoup de paiens. . . ." P. Larhargou, *Noveau cours d'apologétique* (Paris 1927) 289.

[8] "Il peut donc arriver qu'on appartienne au corps de l'Église sans appartenir à son âme, et qu'on appartienne à son âme sans appartenir à son corps." P. Larhargou, *L'église et ses temoins dans le monde.* (Paris 1927) 489.

[9] "Elles sont sauvés, non pas hors de l'Église, mais dans l'Église, à l'âme de laquelle elles appartenaient par la vie surnaturelle qu'elles ont menée. . . ." *Ibid.,* 491.

[10] "Ecclesia omnibus hominibus ad salutem aeternam obtinendam necessitate medii necessaria est." L. Lercher, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* 1 (Oeniponte 1927) 441.

[11] "Ipsum externum medium re adhibitum, eiusdemque medii votum non sunt duo media disjuncta, sed se habent sicut res ipsa ad quoddam eius vicarium, quare solum illud votum a Deo pro ipsa re acceptatur, quod ex virtute sua interna hominem efficaciter impellit ad capessandum medium

In 1928, M. Masl published a *De ecclesia* based upon the earlier work of Bonal. Though he used Bonal as a basis, he so re-works the text that his volume can be considered an original, personal work. Speaking of the necessity of the Church, Masl makes the distinction between the body and soul of the Church. Since the Holy Spirit is the soul of the Church, His vivifying influence cannot be felt by a person who bears no union with the body of the Church: "Just as in the human body, there is nothing in the mind which is not first in the senses, so no one comes in contact with the Holy Spirit, the soul of the Church, without first being in the body animated by Him (Holy Spirit)."[13] The doctrine demands that a person be united to the Church in some way: "Outside the Church no salvation is absolutely true, for anyone who is seeking salvation must pertain to the visible Church *at least in some way*."[14] Those outside the Church in good faith can be saved, only because they pertain to both the soul and body of the Church. It is because of this relation to the body of the Church that they are constituted, in the words of Franzelin, "invisible members"; and in the words of Caperan, members "at heart."[15] This explanation represents a complete re-writing of Bonal's simple body-soul explanation.

---

externum, dummodo cognoscatur et opportunitas medii abhibendi se offert." *Ibid.*, 442.

[12] See *ibid.*, 448.

[13] "Et sicut in corpore humano, nihil in animam venit quin prius fuerit in sensu, ita nihil ad Spiritum Sanctum vel animam Ecclesiae pertingit quin prius fuerit in corpore ab Eo (Spiritu Sancto) animato." M. Masl, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Paris 1928) 27.

[14] "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus est adamussim vera, nam quisquis salutem prosequitur ad Ecclesiam visibilem pertinere debet, saltem aliquo modo. Eius visibilitas est necessaria, siquidem, dempta visibilitate, ruit Ecclesia." *Ibid.*, 28.

[15] See *loc. cit.*

Goupil, writing in 1929, sees the necessity as one of both precept and means: ". . . the Church is necessary for salvation not only with the necessity of precept, but also with the necessity of means; and no one can be saved without belonging to it either in fact or in desire."[16] Necessity of means for him signifies a cause whose influence must be exercised; whose absence renders salvation impossible: "The means is the cause of the effect and if ignorance excuses from culpability, it cannot replace the causality of the means."[17] He also distinguishes the terms *re* and *voto*. The former is easily understood; it is visible belonging to the Church: "This belonging in fact is the normal means of salvation."[18] The latter is different: "To belong to the Church in desire is certainly to belong to it really, but it is to be affiliated with it only by a desire, formulated or not, explicit or implicit, with no exterior sign of this affiliation."[19] This latter affiliation is like "a non-ordinary means of salvation."[20] For it depends not upon the state of things, but upon the will of the legislator and only with his approval can it suffice in certain circumstances. In addition to its acceptance by God, this *votum* suffices because it is composed of dispositions which "attach the individual really to the body of the Church. . . ."[21] Though a man can be saved without belonging to the Church in fact, he cannot be saved unless he belong to the Church in some way: "Every man who is justified and saved who does not belong to the Church visibly 'in fact,' belongs to it by an explicit or implicit desire, but still *really although invisibly*. This degree of belonging suffices for salvation."[22] Goupil is emphatic in stating that all salvation must come *in ecclesia* and *per ecclesiam;* the underlying reason for this is that the votum constitutes a real though invisible union with the Church:

---

[16] ". . . l'Église est necessaire au salut non seulement de necessité de precept, mais aussi de necessité de moyen; et personne ne peut être sauvé sans lui appartenir ou en effet ou de désir." A. Goupil, *L'Église* (Paris 1929) 69.

[17] "C'est que le moyen est cause de l'effet, et que si l'ignorance excuse la faute, elle ne peut remplacer l'action du moyen." *Ibid.*, 70.

[18] "Cette appartenance en effet est le moyen normal de salut." *Loc. cit.*

[19] "Appartenir a l'Eglise en désir c'est bien sans doute lui appartenir reellement, mais c'est ne lui être encore agregé que par un souhait, formulé ou non, explicite ou implicite, sans aucun signe extérieur de cette agregation." *Loc. cit.*

[20] ". . . un moyen non ordainaire de salut." *Ibid.*, 71.

[21] ". . . rattachent réellement cet homme au corps de l'Eglise. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

> Objection: But a person can become a member of Christ invisibly, through the grace received outside the visible Church; therefore without becoming a member of the Church, without necessarily benefiting from the intervention of the Church. Response: This objection does not perceive what the Church truly is. She is the visible body of Christ and the only one. Therefore to say that a person becomes a member of Christ without belonging to the Church is nonsense. It is true, a person can become a member of Christ invisibly and belong to the Church invisibly; but he really and truly belongs to the Church and has received grace only through his dependence upon the Church.[23]

V. Zubizarreta, Archbishop of Santiago in Cuba, authored a four-volume manual of theology which appeared in 1929. He establishes the distinction between necessity of precept and means; and the body and soul of the Church; and pertaining to the Church *in re* and *in voto*. He then makes three statements: "It is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means to pertain at least to the soul of the Church. . . . Likewise it is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means to pertain to the body of the Church in explicit or implicit desire. . . . It is not necessary for salvation with the necessity of means to pertain really to the body of the

---

[22] "Tout homme justifié et sauvé qui n'appartient pas à l'Église 'en effet' visiblement, lui appartient cependant 'de désir' explicite ou implicite, mais bien *réellement quoique invisiblement.* Et cette appartenance suffit pour le salut." *Ibid.,* 76.

[23] "Objection: Mais on peut par le grâce reçue hors de l'Église visible, devenir invisiblement membre du Christ, donc sans devenir membre de l'Église, donc sans passer necessairement par l'intermédiare de l'Église. Reponse: Cette objection ne saisit pas ce qu'est vraiment l'Église. Elle est le corps visible du Christ et le seul. Donc dire qu'on devient membre du Christ sans appartenir a l'Église est un non-sens. Il est vrai, on peut devenir invisiblement membre du Christ et appartient invisiblement a l'Église, mais réellement on appartient a l'Église, et l'on n'a reçu la grâce que dependamment d'elle." *Ibid.,* 73-74.

Church."[24] Coming then to the statement of his thesis, Zubizarreta concerns himself only with the necessity of precept: "The question here concerns the necessity of precept; or whether it is necessary to pertain to the body of the Church *in re,* so that no one who freely and knowingly remains outside it, can be saved."[25] Also in 1929, G. Paris in his *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* gives the usual definitions of necessity of precept and means; pertaining to the Church *in re* and *in voto;* belonging to the body and soul of the Church. Then he states three principles very similar to those of Zubizarreta: "It is of necessity of means to pertain to the soul of the Church. . . . It is of necessity of precept to pertain to the body of the Church *in re*. . . . It is of necessity of means to pertain to the body of the Church at least in implicit desire."[26]

Heris, while not treating of the question explicitly to his brochure on the Church, has portrayed the necessity of the Church as an absolute one. He speaks of the Church's mission as being one of sanctification. In fact sanctity is almost the essence of the Church and it is only through the Church that one can go to Christ. For the sacraments are the means of sanctification and they are entrusted to the Church: "The sacraments are the indispensable intermediary which connects us to the humanity of Our Saviour; and since the Church is the depository and the dispenser of them, it is by her, and by her alone, that we can go to Christ and drink at the source of all holiness."[27] This does not mean that only members of the Church can be saved; others can be, but only through their relation to the Church: "Without doubt it can come about that sinners of good faith can be justified without belonging explicitly to the Church; but their wills must be oriented toward her, at least in an implicit manner; first justification which erases in us the stain of original sin is not accomplished except by baptism and in its absence, by the desire, at least implicit, for baptism."[28] Thus the sacraments remain the "point of departure of our spiritual birth."[29] Every man must be related to the Church in some way in order to be sanctified: "In every way, it appears that the Church, by the eucharistic sacrifice and by the sacraments, has a principal role in the sanctification of souls. No one can be justified except by the Church and in the Church, and all the souls capable of receiving grace belong to her visibly or invisibly, as they belong to Christ. The Church is the way which leads to Christ, as Christ is the way which leads to God."[30] Speaking in another section, Heris indicates once more that "no soul is saved except by its attachment, at least implicitly willed, to the Church. . . ."[31] Heris gives no extensive attention to the exact nature of the implicit attachment to the Church, but he is clear in seeing the Church as the cause of all salvation; further all salvation comes only to those who are in the Church. Though this latter point is not elaborated, it is nevertheless firmly established.

---

[24] "Necessarium est, necessitate medii ad salutem, pertinere saltem ad animam Ecclesiae. . . . Necessarium pariter est, necessitate medii ad salutem, pertinere in voto explicito vel implicito ad corpus Ecclesiae. . . . Non est necessarium, necessitate medii ad salutem pertinere in re ad corpus Ecclesiae." V. Zubizarreta, *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica* 1 (Bilboa 1929) 333.

[25] "Quaestio est de necessitate praecepti, et inquiritur, an sit ita necessarium ad corpus Ecclesiae in re pertinere, ut nemo, scienter et libere extra eam manens, salvus esse." *Loc. cit.*

[26] "Pertinere ad animam Ecclesiae est de necessitate medii. . . . Pertinere ad corpus Ecclesiae in re est de necessitate praecepti. . . . Pertinere ad corpus Ecclesiae in voto saltem implicito est de necessitate medii." G. Paris, *Tractatus de ecclesiae Christi* (Melitae 1929) 73.

[27] "Les sacrements sont l'intermediare indispensable qui nous relié a cette humanité de notre Sauveur, et puisque l'Église en est la depositaire et la dispentrice, c'est par elle et par elle seulement que nous pouvons aller au Christ et boire a la source de toute sainteté." Ch. V. Heris, *L'église du Christ* (Seine-et-Oise 1930) 19-20.

In 1931, in a book which he himself styles as merely a group of essays on the nature of the Church and the work which the Church is set to accomplish, Goyau speaks of "L'église catholique et les autres brebis." He quotes frequently from Bainvel's article in *Etudes* and asserts that all who are saved must pertain to the Church either *in re* or *in voto*. This votum suffices because in the eyes of God it is equivalent to the fact and because it effects a true union with the Church.[32]

---

[28] "Sans doute il peut se faire que des pécheurs de bonne foi soient justifiés sans appartenir explicitement à l'Église, mais il faut qu'au moins d'une manière implicite leur volonté s'oriente vers elle: la justification première en effet qui efface en nous la tache du péché originel ne s'opère que par le baptême, et, à son defaut, par le désire au moins implicte du baptême." *Ibid.,* 20.

[29] ". . . point de depart de notre naissance spirituelle." *Ibid.,* 21.

[30] "De toute manière, il apparait que l'Église, par le sacrifice eucharistique et par les sacrements, a un rôle capital dans la sanctification des âmes. Nul ne saurait être justifié que par l'Église et dans l'Église, et toutes les âmes susceptibles de recevoir la grâce, lui appartiennent visiblement ou invisiblement, comme elles appartiennent au Christ. L'Église est la voie qui mène au Christ, comme le Christ est la voie qui mène a Dieu." *Loc. cit.*

[31] ". . . aucune âme n'est sauvée que par son rattachement, au moins implicitement voulu, a l'Église. . . ." *Ibid.,* 25.

A treatise on the Church by P. Lippert appeared in its German original in 1931 and was translated into the French by Regis Jolivet, professor of the Catholic Faculty of Lyons in 1933. In a chapter entitled "The Members of the Church," the author considers the question of the Church's necessity. He states that the Church is the sole means of salvation and then indicates immediately what he means by the term "Church": "We can say that the Church of Christ is composed of all the men whom Christ possesses, who have come into his power, in any manner whatsoever, and have been placed, with more or less ultimate success, upon the road which leads to the Father. Thus it is evident that outside of this Church, that is to say, outside of the men belonging to Christ, there can be no salvation."[33] We must seek the meaning of the axiom "outside the Church no salvation" in the determination of the ways in which one can belong to the Church.

> For what is the sense of this doctrine according to which the Church is the necessary means of salvation, a doctrine which since Saint Cyprian is expressed in the formula: *salus extra ecclesiam non est*—outside the Church no salvation? We cannot determine the only possible sense, and consequently the only acceptable sense of this profession of faith, apparently so fundamentally intolerant, except by solving the problem of the members of the Church; that is to say the problem of understand-

---

[32] See G. Goyau, *Le catholicisme* (Paris 1931) 281-282.

[33] "Mann kann sagen, die Kirche Jesu Christi besteht aus all den Menschen, die von Christus in irgend einer Weise bereits ergriffen, an der Hand genommen und mit einem geröseren oder geringeren Grade der endlichen Vollendung aus den Weg sum Vater gestellt sind. Darum ist est selbstverständlich, das es auserhalb dieser Kirche, das heist der von Christus ergriffenen Menschen, kein Heil geben kann." P. Lippert, S.J., *Die Kirche Christi* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1931) 259-260.

> ing what properly constitutes belonging to the Church and what are the conditions, the degrees and the divers modes of that belonging.[34]

The first way of belonging to the Church is by baptism and the profession of faith. Secondly, all those who possess sanctifying grace belong to the Church. "It is clear that all those souls in whom Christ is present by the communication of the grace which makes them children of God, belong also to His Church."[35] So it is clear that the author considers membership to be attainable in two ways. He returns to this point in another place: ". . . for those who have not the external tie of baptism and the profession of faith, the act of perfect charity is the sole and indispensable means of union with the Church."[36] Thus all who are in the state of grace belong to the Church; if they do not have the external ties of profession of faith and baptism, they are in the soul of the Church: "the possession of this divine life will be reckoned as incorporating them into the soul of the Church."[37]

Membership in the Church is not an indivisible nor a simple reality; it is very complex and men may belong to the Church in varying degrees: "the quality of members of the church is not a simple, uniform thing of equal value in all the members of the

---

[34] Welches ist nun der Sinn dieser Heilsnotwendigkeit der Kirche, die seit Cyprians Zeit in das Wort gekleidet wurde: "Salus extra ecclesiam non est—ein Heil gibt es auserhalb der Kirche nicht," unde die wir heute in der noch kürzeren und fast noch schrofferen Redeweise von der 'alleinseligmachenden Kirche' ausdrüchen? Der überhaupt mögliche und darum auch einzig erträgliche Sinn dieses Bekenntnisses von anscheinend äuserster Intoleranz ist nur zu gewinnen, ween wir die Frage der Mitgliedschaft der Kirche klären, das heist die Frage, worin die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche eigentlich besteht und welches ihre Bedingungen, ihre Grade und ihre Entwicklungen sein können." *Ibid.*, 261-262.

[35] Es ist klar, das alle Seelen, in deren innerster Mitte Christus gegenwärtig ist durch die Mitteilung der Kindschaftsgnade, auch zu seiner Kirche gehören." *Ibid.*, 262.

[36] "Darum können und müssen alle jene als Mitglieder der Kirche bezeichnet werden in denen Christus in irgend einer Weise zu wirken begonnen hat, oder in denen er noch fortwirkt." *Ibid.*, 262-263.

[37] "Der Besitz dieses göttlichen Lebens wird aber als Zugehörigkeit zur Seele der Kirche bezeichnet." *Ibid.*, 275.

Church; on the contrary it admits of numberless degrees. . . ."[38] Therefore the extension of the Church will depend on how one interprets the concept of membership. For example, a person who has received baptism and then subsequently loses all other connection with the Church, including the state of grace, still remains a member of the Church.[39] Most frequently, Lippert returns to the statement that all those in the state of grace are members of the Church: "But if we consider the quality of membership as flowing from the fellowship of the supernatural grace of Christ . . . then the frontiers defined by the visible organization become too narrow, for they leave outside the Church all those men who are certainly subject to the influence of the grace of Christ."[40] Thus the extension of the Church is really enormous; for if we take "belong to the Church" as indicating an interior union with Christ then: "we must ascribe to the Church an immense domain stretching invisibly, but nevertheless certainly and absolutely, even into the non-Catholic world, which it encompasses; a world already enlightened, but poorly, by the first glimmerings of the dawn, namely the centuries which have prepared for the coming of Christ."[41] In reality the Church touches all men for:

---

[38] "Aus der Verschiedenheit der Methoden, die Zughörigkeit zur Kirche geschichtlich und juristisch festzustellen, ergibt sich nun aber, das diese Mitgliedschaft nicht eine eindeutige und in allen Mitgliedern völlig gleichartige und gleichwertige Gröse ist." *Ibid.*, 267.

[39] "Er lebt also auch in einer Nähe und in einer Verbindung mit Christus, die durch die Kirche vermittelt wird, und kann darum mit einem wirklichen Recht als Glied der Kirche bezeichnet werden." *Ibid.*, 266.

[40] "Wenn wir aber unter Mitgliedschaft die lebendige Verbindung mit den Gnadenkräften Christi, also den metaphysischen Sinn der Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche im Auge haben, dann sind jene Organisationsgrenizen zu eng. Denn sie schliesen jene Menschen nicht mit ein, die zwar schon unter dem gnadenvollen Einflus Christi stehen, vielleicht schon mit dem vollen Leben eines Gotteskindes von ihm überströmt sind, aber aus irgend einem zufälligen oder schicksalhaften Grund in keiner Weise, weder durch Taufe noch durch geistige Anerkennung an der Gemeinschaft der Kirche teilnehmen." *Ibid.*, 267.

[41] "Wenn wir nun aber die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche Christi in diesem innern und lebendigen Sinne fassen, dann müssen wir ihre Grenzen so unermeslich weit ziehen, das sie, zwar unsichtbar, abor doch bestimmt und fest weithin durch die nichtkatholische Welt reichen, das sie in leis Aufdämmern der Sichtbarkeit sogar zurückreichen bis in die vorkirchlichen Jahrtausende der Vorbereitung." *Ibid.*, 269-270.

> . . . the light which shines from Christ and from the centre of the world which is His Church, carries even to the very limits of humanity. We then see clearly that there is absolutely no individual who can be completely outside this domain of Christ, nor consequently outside His Church; for if the Good Shepherd, traveling visibly over the earth under the form of His Church, does not touch every man with His hand or the sound of His voice, at least the brilliant and vivifying light which bursts from His Heart . . . extends far and wide and "illumines every man who comes into the world." In one way or another, at one time or another, every human being who has attained a sense of morality or responsibility, perceives a ray of this light. . . .[42]

There are several difficulties here. First the causative role of the Church in the process of salvation is not described. All who are in sanctifying grace are in the Church, but there is no insistence that this grace came to them only because of their union with the Church. Secondly no distinction is made in the manner in which people are united to the Church. Membership results either from baptism and subjection to the rulers of the Church; or from the possession of sanctifying grace. Both classes of individuals are in the Church; but since their mode of existence within the Church is not distinguished, the frontiers of the Church are extended to include them both. The result is an extension of the Catholic Church which deprives it of its identity. The Church of which Lippert is speaking is not the Church signified in the axiom "outside the Church no salvation." So here again we encounter an emphasis upon the personal union with Christ which minimizes, if not totally destroys, the importance of union with the visible Church.

---

[42] "Denn es zeight sich, sas die Strahlen, die von Christus und von der Weltmitte in seiner Kirche ausgehen, so weit reichen, wie die Bezirke des Menschentums reichen. Das wohl kein einziger Mensch ganz auserhalb dieses Bereiches Christi und damit auch auserhalb der Kirche fällt; das der gute Hirte, der in seiner Kirche sichtbar über die Erde wandelt, zwar nicht übersall hinreicht mit seinen ausgestreckten Händen und mit dem Klang seiner Stimme, das aber die wärmenden und leuchtenden Strahlen, die aus seinem Herzen kommen—und dieses Herz lebt und schlägt doch eben in seiner Kirche—weithin gehen und 'jeden Menschen erdeuchten der in diese Welt kommt.' Irgendwo und irgendwann kommt tatsächlich zu jeder Menshenseele, die je zu Verantwortlichkeit und Bewustsein gelangt ist, eine Welle dieses Lichtes. . . ." *Ibid.*, 271-272.

In the same vein is the treatment of Joseph Falcon. He states that the Church is necessary because it was instituted by Christ to continue his mission; that mission is the salvation of men. Because of this end, the Church is necessary for salvation:

> "Outside the Church, no salvation"; this is a dogma of the faith; it is also the fundamental and irreducible difference which separates Catholicism from Protestantism. —It is necessary, however, to understand this formula. "Outside the Church, no salvation," by right, and supposing conscious disobedience to Christ; for then, it means: outside of Christ and the means of Christ, no salvation.
>
> But actually, as we have said, every man of goodwill can form part of the invisible Church, can become a child of God and be saved. For God does not ask the impossible; and the grace which raises us to the supernatural order is not, of its nature, attached to the sacraments and to the Church.—The members of the invisible Church, who live outside the visible society, are, because of their separated condition, deprived only of the abundance of spiritual aides which it is the privilege of that society to possess.[43]

In order to understand what Falcon is saying here, we must turn back a few pages. After describing the visibility of the Church, he says: "However alongside the visible Church . . . we do not deny the existence of an invisible or spiritual Church, a society of souls who, whether they belong to the visible Church or not, are in the state of grace."[44]

---

[43] " 'Hors de l'Église, point de salut'; c'est un dogme de foi; c'est aussi la différence fondamentale et irréductible qui sépare le catholicisme du protestantisme.—Il faut, pourtant, entendre cette formule. 'Hors de l'Eglise, point de salut,' *en droit, et supposée la désobéissance consciente* au Christ; car alors, elle signifie: hors du Christ et des moyen du Christ, point de salut.

"Mais, en fait, nous l'avons dit, toute âme de bonne volonté peut faire partie de l'Église invisible, devenir enfant de Dieu et être sauvée. Car Dieu ne demande pas l'impossible; et la grâce, qui nous introduit dans l'ordre surnaturel, n'est pas de sa nature attachée aux sacrements et à l'Église.—Les membres de l'Église invisible, qui vivent en dehors de la société visible, sont seulement privés, de par leur situation extérieure, de l'abondance de secours spirituels dont cette société a le privilège." J. Falcon, *La credibilité du dogme Catholique. Apologétique scientifique* (Paris 1933) 488.

In this invisible Church all types of men can attain grace; in his next paragraph, Falcon states:

> This invisible Church, without doubt, surpasses the visible Church; and we recognize that heretical and schismatic Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, pagans, free thinkers can all form part of it. For it suffices that they are in the state of grace; and presupposing good faith, they can possess grace merely by satisfying the elementary conditions requisite for justification. They are then in the eyes of God, true children, living members of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ; which, alas, cannot be said of everyone who belongs to the visible Church. This is the reason why it is essential to be part of the invisible Church, whereas it is not absolutely necessary in regard to the visible Church.[45]

In the next two paragraphs, Falcon describes the relationship of the visible and invisible Church:

> However the visible Church remains the family home of the invisible Church, that is, of the soul in the state of grace; and normally, "outside of the Church there is no salvation." Such is the will of Christ, and only impossibility and invincible ignorance can dispense a person

---

[44] "Cependant à coté de l'Église *visible . . . nous ne nions pas l'existence d'une Église invisible,* ou spirituelle, société des âmes qui, appartenant ou non à l'Église visible, se trouvent, au moment où on les considère, en état de grâce." *Ibid.,* 484.

[45] "Cette Église invisible, sans aucun doute, deborde l'Église visible; et nous savons que des chrétiens hérétiques ou schismatiques, des Juifs, des musulmans, des païens, des libre-penseurs peuvent en faire partie. Car il leur suffit d'être en état de grâce; et, pour y être, la bonne foi étant présupposée, ils n'ont qu'à satisfaire aux conditions élementaires requises pour la justification. Ce sont alors, au yeux de Dieu, de vrais enfants, des membres vivants du corps mystique de Jésus-Christ; ce qui, hélas! ne peut se dire de quiconque appartient à l'Église visible. Et voilà pourquoi, il est essentiel de faire partie de l'Église invisible, tandis qu'il ne l'est pas absolument en ce qui concerne l'Église visible." *Loc. cit.*

> from the necessity of belonging to the visible Church. Actually, the visible Church takes us and leads us by the hand to the invisible Master, giving us the means to live to the full our life as children of God; this is the reason Christ wishes us to be enrolled in the visible Church. It is not the visible Church that we believe in; we verify its existence by its organization, its life and its history; but we believe in the total Church. We believe that this society vivifies those who give themselves to it and leads them even to the door of salvation.[46]

Fundamentally, Falcon is using the body-soul distinction: however he expresses it in the terms *église visible* and *église invisible*. The combination of these two is the *église totale* and this latter is the Church which is necessary for salvation. Again the role of the "invisible Church" seems to be emphasized to the detriment of the "visible Church." The only necessity connected with the Church is one of precept, since the axiom "outside the Church no salvation" is true only "by right and supposing conscious disobedience to Christ." The absolutely important element in the process of salvation is spiritual union with Christ, the state of grace; this places a person within the "invisible Church" and makes salvation possible. Falcon does not indicate that these benefits can be obtained only through union with the Roman Catholic Church. As the author explains it, those who "satisfy the elementary requisites for justification" become living members of the Mystical Body; and this is more than can be said for some of the people who belong to the Church. For this reason "it is essential to become part of the invisible Church, whereas it is not absolutely necessary in regard to the visible Church." This is indeed a generous view when examined in the light of the steady theological development which has stressed more and more strongly the vital function of union with the Roman Catholic Church.

---

[46] "Il reste pourtant que l'Église visible est la maison familiale de l'Église invisible, c'est-à-dire des âmes en état de grâce; et que, *normalement* (italics added), 'hors de l'Église, il n'ya a point de salut.' Telle est la volonté du Christ, et seules l'impossibilité et l'ignorance invincible peuvent dispenser quelqu'un de la necessité d'appartenir à l'Église visible.—En fait, celle-ci nous guide, comme par la main, jusqu'au Maître invisible, nous donnant les moyens de vivre pleinement notre vie d'enfants de Dieu; c'est pourquoi le Christ veut nous y enrôler.

"Ce n'est pas à l'Église visible que nous croyons: nous la constatons par son organisation, sa vie et son histoire; mais on croit à l'Église totale. On croit que cette société vivifie ceux qui se donnent à elle et les conduit jusqu'au port du salut." *Loc. cit.*

In 1934, H. Mathieu published a brochure entitled *What is the true religion?* He quotes at length from Hugon, Bainvel and Caperan. He distinguishes belonging to the Church as a member (*adhésion publique*) and belonging to the Church by "implicit desire and good faith."[47] People who belong to the Church in the second way, though exteriorly strangers to the Church "actually are part of it, at heart."[48] For Mathieu, these two ways of being united to the Church point to the existence of two unequal societies: "Thus the Catholic Church is not only composed of a body comprising visible, and if we may use the term, official members. It has in addition a soul, which greatly surpasses its visible body and which embraces an incalculable number of faithful souls known only to God; they are Catholic without knowing it."[49] For Mathieu the *in re-in voto* distinction is inseparable from that understanding of the body and soul of the Church wherein the soul is wider in extent than the body. As has been noted, some of the Fathers of the Vatican Council were of a similar frame of mind.[50] However the theological trend since that time has been to separate the two distinctions; to find one of supreme value in explaining the doctrine of the necessity of the Church and to reject the other as inadequate. Mathieu here has returned to the earlier confusion of the two concepts.

Pollet in his 1935 *Ecclesiologia* records three explanations of this doctrine. First he states this thesis: "The Church is a necessary means of salvation."[51] In explaining the thesis, he divides necessity into necessity of precept and means; the latter is either intrinsic or extrinsic depending upon its source: the positive institution of God or the very nature of things. The necessity of the Church, he states, is one of extrinsic means, depending as it does upon the positive institution of God. Describing this type of necessity, he writes: "Necessity of extrinsic means . . . does not urge in the case of invincible ignorance or impossibilities."[52] Such an explanation can be easily harmonized with the doctrine of the salvific will of God; for the necessity of pertaining to the Church is basically only a law "which admits of some exceptions."[53] Pollet's second explanation reads: "it is necessary to pertain to the Church either *in re* or at least *in voto*. This necessity allows for no exceptions."[54] The reason for this is that every act of faith or supernatural virtue includes necessarily this *votum*. Finally, Pollet states: "it is necessary to pertain to the soul of the Church actually (or really) and to the body of the Church actually or in desire."[55] For Pollet belonging to the soul of the Church is the same as belonging to the body of the Church in desire. Thus he merely groups several existing explanations and makes no attempt to evaluate them.

---

[47] See H. Mathieu, *Quelle est la véritable religion?* (Paris 1934) 197.

[48] "En font partie, en fait, de coeur." *Ibid.*, 198.

[49] "Ainsi l'Église catholique n'est pas seulement composée d'un corps comprenant des membres visibles, et, si l'on peut dire, officiels. Elle possède une âme qui deborde de beaucoup son corps visible et qui embrasse un nombre incalculable de fidèles connus de Dieu seul et catholiques sans le savoir." *Ibid.*, 200-201.

[50] See above, 30 ff.

[51] "Ecclesia est medium necessarium ad salutem, aut: necesse est adhaerere Ecclesiae ad salutem consequendam." R. Pollet, *Ecclesiologia seu de Ecclesia Catholica tractatus* (Rome 1935) 509.

Also in 1935, Lepicier expresses the proposition: "There is one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved."[56] His whole treatment is pointed to showing that this is the teaching contained in the magisterial documents and the patristic writings. He insists that the doctrine is not cruel, but that it needs to be explained. For such an explanation, he refers the reader to the works of Hugon and Dublanchy. He himself is content to record the positive evidence of the doctrine. He gives no explanation of it.

L. Kosters in his small brochure on the Church explains that all men who are justified pertain to the soul of the Church and also to the body of the Church at least in desire.[57] In 1937 Mgr. Besson, bishop of Lausanne, Geneva and Fribourg, spoke in the Cathedral in Lyons on the occasion of the octave for Christian unity. The address appeared in the *Revue apologétique* later in the same year. The bishop in the course of his address speaks of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. He explains: "The axiom 'Outside the Church no salvation' is valid in regard to those who belong to the visible Church neither visibly nor invisibly; neither by the sacraments, nor spiritually; neither in fact nor in desire; not even in implicit desire."[58] Also in 1937, Fraghi has in his *De membris ecclesiae* a corollary concerning this doctrine. The doctrine is expressed in this statement: "For all men, union with the body of Christ is a necessary means of salvation."[59] Since the Church is the Body of Christ, the same necessity is applicable to her. Fraghi continues: "Therefore the Church is necessary for salvation with the necessity of precept and the necessity of means, this latter being taken in broad sense. The meaning is that if anyone cannot actually be a member of the Church, it will suffice if he pertain to the Church at least in desire."[60] This desire may be either explicit or implicit. Therefore the axiom is to be understood as requiring some positive union with the Church: "Hence it is apparent how the words 'Outside the Church no salvation' are to be understood. Not only those adults who are actually in the Church can attain salvation, but also those who have either an implicit or explicit desire of pertaining to the Church."[61] Thus Fraghi continues the tradition of viewing some union with the visible Church as being the keystone in any process of salvation.

---

[52] "Necessitas medii extrinseca . . . non urget in casu ignorantiae invincibilia et impotentia." *Ibid.,* 506.

[53] ". . . quae tamen aliquot exceptiones patitur." *Loc. cit.*

[54] ". . . Necesse est pertinere ad Ecclesiam re, aut saltem voto. Et haec necessitas nullam exceptionem patitur." *Ibid.,* 507.

[55] ". . . necesse est pertinere ad animam Ecclesiae re (aut realiter); ad corpus re aut saltem voto." *Ibid.,* 508.

[56] "Una est fidelium universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur." A. Lepicier, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Rome 1935) 64.

---

[57] See Ludwig Kosters, *L'église de notre foi,* trans. P. Mazoyer & A. Gate (Paris 1938) 280.

[58] "L'axiome 'Hors de l'Église pas de salut' vaut donc contre ceux qui n'appartiennent à l'Église visible ni visiblement ni invisiblement, ne par les sacrements ni par l'esprit, ni en fait ni en désir, même implicite." M. Besson, "L'appartenance invisible au royaume de Dieu." *Revue apologetique* 64 (1937) 385-401.

[59] "Coniunctio cum corpore Christi est pro omnibus medium necessarium ad salutem." S. Fraghi, *De membris ecclesiae* (Rome 1937) 35.

[60] "Ecclesia ergo est necessaria ad salutem consequendam, necessitate praecepti et necessitate medii late sumpta, eo sensu quod si quis actualiter nequiret, esse membrum Ecclesiae, sufficeret ut pertineat ad ecclesiam satlem voto." *Loc. cit.*

2. OTTO KARRER

At this point it is necessary to return to the year 1934 to consider a significant exposition of the meaning of the doctrine of the Church's necessity by Dr. Otto Karrer. This exposition will be given close attention because it is representative of what may be termed an internalist approach. The volume to be considered appeared in the German in 1934 and was translated into English in 1936. It grew out of a series of lectures delivered by the author in several cities—for example to the Union of High School Students at Lucerne and at the High School attached to the University of Zurich—before audiences of mixed denominations. Chapter thirteen of this book is entitled: "Salvation Outside the Visible Church." In an effort to record Karrer's view accurately, the chapter will be considered in two sections; the first establishes the point that salvation is possible for non-Catholics, the second explains how this salvation is accomplished.

Section 1

Karrer first complains that many of the Catholics who have treated the doctrine of the Church's necessity have done so in such a way as to leave the Church open to valid charges of intolerance. This has been true not only of the writers of Christian antiquity but even of modern writers. He says:

> Even modern theologians have maintained as a "self-evident" truth that a spiritual life, supernatural and inspired by grace, can belong only to saints and devout persons within the Church, and that all religion outside the Church, all faith, hope of redemption, moral obedience or mystical experience—has nothing to do with God,

---

[61] "Unde apparet quomodo intelligenda sint verba: 'Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.' Adulti, ut dicebamus, non tantum qui actu sunt in Ecclesia, sed etiam qui votum habent, explicite vel implicite, pertinendi ad Ecclesiam, salutem consequi possunt." *Loc. cit.*

> grace or heaven—is either "purely natural" or actually "diabolic." I cannot bring myself to quote instances.[62]

Some of the language in which this doctrine of the Church's necessity is expressed can be understood by the average reader, "only as meaning that visible membership of the one Church is an indispensable condition of salvation."[63] This leads Karrer to an explanation of some of the strong historical statements of this doctrine.

Quoting the statement of the Council of Florence, he says: "Obviously the definition refers to 'formal' pagans and heretics, that is, to those who in bad faith and in defiance of the known truth remain outside the Church and deny her teaching."[64] Catholics must of course hold that "no man can attain salvation and eternal life who has not Christ for head . . . ,"[65] since the teaching is obviously contained in scripture and in the official teaching of the Church. But Karrer insists that in the magisterial decrees this teaching is always mentioned together with the doctrine that non-Catholics may be saved and it is not valid to quote one teaching apart from the other:

> Throughout the entire body of doctrinal pronouncements there run two distinct and seemingly conflicting series of utterances. The one proclaims the exclusive possession by the visible Church of truth and saving power. The other tells us of an invisible Church spread over the earth with power to save its members inasmuch as all who are in good faith and not responsible for their errors may belong spiritually to the Church, and so reach heaven. Neither of these two series taken by itself and to the exclusion of the other represents the full Catholic doctrine. That doctrine is mutilated when only one of the two is taught. Since they do not contradict each other—indeed they are often propounded together in the same context—they must complete each other.[66]

---

[62] O. Karrer, *Religions of Mankind,* trans. E. I. Watkin (N. Y. 1936) 251.

[63] *Loc. cit.*

[64] *Ibid.,* 251-252.

[65] *Ibid.,* 253.

[66] *Ibid.,* 253-254.

These official pronouncements then are always to be understood of those who knowingly and deliberately remain outside the Church, never of those who are outside from ignorance. He states: "It is therefore un-Catholic to affirm one proposition without the other. Both must be maintained simultaneously, on the one hand that the Church is the ark of salvation, on the other hand that no man of good will is excluded from her membership, but that all such may receive God's grace and be spiritually united with the members of the visible Church."[67] For the Church has always insisted that grace is not limited by the frontiers of the visible Church:

> She teaches explicitly that the reception of grace is not unconditionally bound up with the actual reception of the means of grace, because there is a "baptism of desire" and an "invisible Church" of well-disposed men in receipt of grace and because a man's spiritual destiny depends not upon his conception of truth, his knowledge as such, his intellectual capacity, but upon a disposition of faith, a surrender of the heart to what is recognized as holy, a will that seeks, believes and loves.[68]

It is thus clearly established that salvation is possible for non-Catholics. Karrer then asks how we are to conceive "the fashion by which salvation is conveyed outside visible membership of the Church."[69]

Section 2

In explaining how this salvation is achieved, he lists several principles laid down by the theologians. First, salvation is bestowed upon a person by the free bounty of God. Secondly: "All salvation comes to all men *from Christ.*"[70] Thirdly: "The God Man is thus the objective source of salvation for all men. Its personal appropriation by the individual is effected *by a believing love.*"[71]

---

[67] *Ibid.*, 255.

[68] *Ibid.*, 257.

[69] *Ibid.*, 258.

[70] *Ibid.*, 259.

[71] *Loc. cit.*

Since without faith no man can please God, faith is essential. But a man begins to receive grace as soon as he begins to believe. Emphasizing this point he writes: "Wherever therefore a man hears the voice which invites him to goodness and accepts the call with a wholehearted obedience we may conclude that he is enlightened by God's light and led by His grace. God's will to bestow grace is universal and the actual contact is effected whenever a man surrenders himself to the holiness which his conscience reveals."[72] Fourthly: "A heathen therefore, even the remotest from Christian belief, can become 'a member of God's Kingdom,' a man in the state of grace *without external baptism or sacraments.*"[73] Baptism of desire can bring this justification to any man and we have every reason to suppose that millions of men have attained salvation in this way.

The fifth principle is in the nature of a conclusion drawn from the preceding four. The author says: "From these premises theology has deduced the doctrine of an invisible Church of good men and women in the state of grace *even outside* the communion of the visible Church."[74] For the degree of a man's ignorance has no effect upon his salvation: "Even if a man has no knowledge of a personal God, the Creator and Lord, the Origin and End of his life, provided he obeys the law of holiness as *transcendent* and thereby worships God in practice, even if he does not know that he owes every grace to Christ in His Church, provided he humbly hopes for grace and salvation *from above,* the imperfection of the religious ideas in which he has grown up will not be charged against him."[75] Before leaving this point the author sheds further light upon his concept of the invisible and the visible Church:

> The Catholic view of the world and the human race is based upon the *co-existence and mutual reference of the visible and the invisible Church.* The invisible Church is not, as it were, a second Church in addition to the visible. The visible and invisible Churches are "two dif-

---

[72] *Ibid.,* 261.

[73] *Loc. cit.*

[74] *Ibid.,* 262.

[75] *Loc. cit.*

> ferent aspects" of one and the same order of salvation and are "relative to each other" (Pribilla). The universal Church of Christ has a visible and organized aspect and an invisible and unorganized. The visible order comprises baptized Christian believers under the government of Peter—whether in a state of grace of mortal sin—and is co-extensive with the jurisdiction of Canon Law. The invisible order comprises those in a state of grace—whether organized under the hierarchy or no—and extends as far as the religiously disposed will.[76]

Karrer's sixth point is a description of the relationship of the visible and the invisible Church. He begins by saying: "If the significance and value of the visible Church is thus to be found in the invisible, *for whose sake alone* the former exists, conversely the invisible *depends* for her entire being *upon the visible*. All the power and grace possible and actually realized outside the visible Church are based upon and draw an inexhaustible supply from Christ the God Man and the institution He founded, the deposit of His 'grace and truth' enduring through the ages."[77] The first step in understanding this concept is the realization that the Church in condemning other religious organizations, is merely condemning what in them is un-Catholic or anti-Catholic. Karrer observes: "In the intention of the Church they are condemned in so far as they are un-Catholic or anti-Catholic. . . . In so far therefore as a particular religious body is un-Catholic or anti-Catholic, it cannot, according to Catholic belief, be a channel of grace and salvation. But only *in so far as* it is un-Catholic or anti-Catholic. For of all the religions of mankind not one is wholly un-Catholic or anti-Catholic, wholly opposed to Divine truth."[78] The various cults of polytheists and fetish-worshippers give at least some inkling of a trust in a Divine Being; while Judaism and schismatical and heretical Christian bodies retain "a valuable treasure . . . of divine truth and means of sanctification."[79] From the presence of these Catholic things in the non-Catholic organization, Karrer concludes that these religions are, at least in some measure, channels of grace and instruments of salvation: "In so far, they are unwittingly Catholic and therefore channels of grace and salvation, not indeed in themselves and *as* separated from the Church, but in so far as they are united with her and in virtue of their unconscious but real relationship to the one Catholic Church, the sole ark of human salvation. . . ."[80] Those non-Catholics who are faithful to their consciences and who try to fulfill the religious ideal received from their community or attained by personal faith "are in reality living upon the religious and moral store of Divine truth which is everywhere the same and is everywhere the Life of Christ and Catholic. What is Catholic throughout the world, Catholic features of every religion, and means of developing that believing love whereby men everywhere belong to Christ and His Church, is everywhere the means of salvation."[81] We must realize, Karrer insists, that "everything of positive value in any religion is also Catholic and that an individual or community is un-Catholic only in what he or it denies, in the falsehood which is maintained in contradiction of the Divine revelation."[82]

---

[76] *Ibid.*, 263.
[77] *Ibid.*, 263-264.
[78] *Ibid.*, 264.
[79] *Ibid.*, 265.

Only in this comprehensive view can one understand the absolute claim of the Church to be the ark of salvation. Karrer states that his view does not hazard that claim but rather it squarely faces the fact, "that the only way by which that absolute claim can be made convincing is to show how the adherents of religions and philosophies outside the Church or Christianity have saved their souls within their respective creeds, and have done so by the grace of God attaching itself to their good faith and teaching them to cherish and put in practice 'those features of their worship, doctrine, philosophy and religious community which are true and good and from God.' "[83] How such people can save themselves in their respective creed is described by Newman and this description is quoted approvingly by Karrer. In the beginning God scattered the seeds of truth far and wide over the earth. So that all religions, at least in their origins were from God. Actually the only difference between the existing religions today is that:

---

[80] *Loc. cit.*

[81] *Loc. cit.*

[82] *Ibid.*, 266.

[83] *Ibid.*, 267.

> . . . heathen religions are a true religion corrupted; the Jewish, a true religion dead; and Christianity, the religion living and perfect. . . . And from the beginning such a creed, such a theology was, I grant, the work of a supernatural principle which, exercising itself first in the rudiments of truth, finished in its perfection. Man cannot determine in what instances that principle of grace is present and in what not, except by the event, but wherever it is, whether it can be ascertained by man or not, whether it reaches its destination, which is Catholicity, or whether it is ultimately frustrated and fails, still in every case the Church claims that work as her own; because it tends to her, because it is recognized by all men, even enemies, to belong to her, because it comes of that divine power, which is given to her in fulness.[84]

Until proof is given to the contrary, we must suppose that all non-Catholics are in good faith and so "they belong, not indeed to the body, but to the soul of the Church, are members of the one Catholic Church, not visible it is true, but invisible; as the theologians say, not 're' in external fact, but 'voto' in will. . . ."[85] We must not blind ourselves to the genuine manifestation of the life of Christ produced outside the frontiers of the Church. For the "Catholic things" present in all religions can have a salvific influence; they all contribute to the formation of the membership of the body of Christ; a membership which includes all "righteous men anywhere."[86]

Karrer returns to the concept of an invisible Church and tries to cast this concept in clearer lines. He maintains that there is no contradiction at all in calling the Church both visible and invisible:

> In reality these are two aspects of the same truth which complete each other. The Church beholds herself as the

---

[84] J. H. Newman, quoted by O. Karrer, *ibid.*, 268.

[85] *Ibid.*, 270.

[86] *Ibid.*, 273.

> Divinely ordained visible community of those who are baptized in the name of Christ, but also as the community of God's invisible Kingdom, inwardly, however, dependent upon the visible institution and living by a secret participation in her faith and Sacraments, "the Church of the elect," of the spiritually baptized, of those in a state of grace, of those who abide in or return to union with God. . . .[87]

Finally Karrer brings his treatment to a close with this summary statement:

> At bottom, we said at the beginning, there is only one religion garbed in various forms. Now we know that this one religion is *the Catholic religion* which lives in all men and saves all men in so far as they share the treasures of truth and grace bestowed upon that religion in their fulness. What is Catholic throughout the world, according to the essential principle of Catholicism, is what is Divine in the world and conducive to everlasting bliss.[88]

As he indicates in one place, Karrer accepts the theologian's distinction between pertaining to the Church *in re* and *in voto*. His investigation, carried on in the field of comparative religion is an attempt to understand that *votum* and to determine the basis upon which it rests. His original lectures were given to groups of mixed denominations and as he himself admits, "the situation being as I have just pointed out, the attempt cannot avoid defects, and has a right to claim the reader's indulgence."[89] An understanding of the purpose of the investigation should certainly gain for the author the indulgence he requests. However the task still remains to determine where Karrer's view fits into the development of theological teaching on the Church's necessity and to calculate its effect upon that development.

Karrer regards all those who are spiritually united to the visible Church as forming an invisible Church. These are necessarily related one to the other; but the invisible Church is much more extensive than the visible Church. This distinction between visible and invisible Church has been encountered before, notably in a work by E. I. Watkin who is the translator of this volume by Karrer.

---

[87] *Ibid.*, 275-276.

[88] *Ibid.*, 276.

[89] *Ibid.*, ix.

Karrer states that "the visible and invisible Churches are two different aspects of one and the same order of salvation and are relative to each other." The invisible Church however "extends as far as the religiously disposed will." It includes within it all in the state of grace. Certainly this invisible Church seems to be the more important. The Church of which Karrer predicates a necessity for salvation is a combination of this invisible and visible Church. Such a statement of the doctrine is not identical to the simple contention that it is the Roman Catholic Church which is necessary for salvation. In the light of Karrer's concentration upon the importance of union with God through grace, and the tremendous extension and value he attributes to the invisible Church, the importance of the hierarchical society is but dimly perceived.

In explaining how the salvation of non-Catholics comes about Karrer accepts Adam's view of non-Catholic creeds. They are a mixture of Catholic and non-Catholic things and the Catholic things can effect salvation. These Catholic things are a "valuable treasure . . . of divine truth and means of sanctification." Again "what is Catholic throughout the world, Catholic features of every religion and means of developing that believing love whereby men everywhere belong to Christ and His Church, is everywhere the means of salvation." Thus what is necessary for salvation is not the visible society called the Roman Catholic Church, but Catholic things, Catholic truths, which are scattered all over the world in varying degrees and existing fully only in the visible Church. That Church is necessary solely as a source of energy and vitality for those Catholic things.

This interpretation would account for the necessity of salvation coming *per ecclesiam;* it seems to minimize at the same time any necessity of that salvation being accomplished *in ecclesia.* In proposing this concept of "scattered Catholic things" Karrer weakens the whole concept of a divinely established society which constitutes the exclusive way of salvation for all men. It is difficult to harmonize this concept with the Church's understanding of herself: the one and only kingdom of God on earth.

Like Adam, Karrer turned his attention toward the role which other religions could play in the process of salvation. His conclusion was identical with that of Adam. And indeed it was bound to be, inasmuch as he felt that the only way to establish the Church's absolute claim was to show how all people could be saved within their respective creeds. This he explained very well and thus thought he had vindicated the Church's absolute claim. Earlier authors had felt that claim was vindicated by indicating how all men must be united to the Roman Catholic Church in some way. The difference in methodology is very great. Karrer, as Adam before him, began with the evidence of experience. Many elements could be isolated in non-Catholic religions and shown to be "good." In order to preserve the Church's claim, then, such elements had to be called in addition "Catholic," thus giving rise to the opinion that the Church contains all the elements of salvation in their fullness, while other religions possess varying degrees of them. It became simple then to outline the process of salvation for non-Catholics. By God's grace and the "Catholic elements" they were saved. Immediately another conclusion forced its way to the fore. All these "saved" people were united to God and thus had to be reckoned as some sort of members of the Church. For they were in a certain sense the Church of Christ as much as, and perhaps even more than, baptized Catholics. Thus the distinction of visible and invisible Church was introduced. Actually this was but the re-introduction of the old body-soul distinction which had been set aside by theologians as being of no use in explaining this doctrine. The new form of this distinction also had its drawbacks. It greatly minimized the importance of the visible Church. Though it was stated that the visible Church and the invisible Church were merely aspects of the one Church, such obviously was not the case. The invisible was much wider in extent; its requirements for membership quite different from those of the visible Church. It would seem then that Karrer's treatment represents no advance, but rather a retrogression. However his consideration of the "Catholic elements" supported Adam's earlier view and thus turned the attention of theologians upon the influence these elements could exert. It was now their task to determine whether any Catholic element in non-Catholic religions could be accepted as "a channel of grace and salvation" without rendering false the claim that all salvation came in and through the Roman Catholic Church.

3. SUMMARY

The theological expositions of this period may be divided into three groups. First there were the authors who continued the use of the *in re-in voto* distinction. In his group were: Lercher, Goupil, Goyau, Besson, Fraghi, Heris, and Berry. They all single out union with the Church as the essential element in the salvation of every man. Lercher, Fraghi and Berry wrote strictly theological treatises. Goupil, Goyau, and Heris wrote essay-type brochures of less scientific nature. In both classes of works there was found the same insistence upon the absolute necessity of some union with the visible Church.

Secondly there were the authors who continued to combine the *in re-in voto* explanation with the body-soul distinction. In this group were: Masl, Zubizarreta, Paris, and Kosters. Their explanation was essentially that of Hugon.

Thirdly there were writers who emphasized greatly the importance of what they called the invisible Church. Lippert included within the Church all those in the state of grace, thus distorting the notion of Church as traditionally understood in relation to the doctrine. Falcon and Karrer stressed the importance of the invisible Church. Mathieu used the *re-voto* distinction; but understood it to mean that all those possessing that desire formed a large society; it was this society which was necessary. Though these explanations vary from one another slightly, they are really similar. All have one fundamental defect: over-emphasis on the internal, spiritual aspect of the Church. This resulted often in a distortion of the Catholic concept of Church; it resulted more often in establishing two distinct Churches, one visible and the other invisible; it always relegated to relative un-importance the external aspect of the Church; it never postulated as absolutely necessary for salvation some union with the Roman Catholic Church. Such a view represents a break with the steady development of the previous decades and is in effect a return to the simple body-soul explanation which had been set aside. It is founded upon a violent separation of the internal, life-giving aspect of the Church and the external, juridical aspect; as if they were separate entities, capable of independent activity.

The remaining three authors are not significant. Lepicier merely stated the doctrine; he gave no explanation. Lahargou used the simple body-soul explanation. Pollet listed three different explanations, giving no evaluation of their relative merit.

CHAPTER VIII

FROM CONGAR TO THE ENCYCLICAL MYSTICI CORPORIS CHRISTI

1. CONGAR

Congar's *Divided Christendom* is not devoted exclusively to the question of the salvation of non-Catholics; yet so significant is this book that a detailed examination of it is essential. It was first published in 1937 and grew out of a series of addresses given by the author at the Church of Sacré-Coeur in Paris during the Unity Octave of 1936. Chapter seven of the book is devoted to an examination of the "Status of our Separated Brethren"; here the author presents his theory concerning the manner in which non-Catholics are saved. Vital to an understanding of this explanation is Congar's concept of the oneness of the Church, which he treats in chapter two. These two chapters taken together form a complex explanation of the salvation of non-Catholics.

The oneness of the Church can be understood only by appreciating the twofold level of unity in the Church; internal and external. The internal unity is founded upon the very unity of the life God communicated to men.

> The oneness of the Church is a communication and extension of the oneness of God Himself. The Life which is in the bosom of the Father is not only communicated within the Godhead itself, thus constituting the Divine Societas of the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity; it is further communicated to creatures by grace, to angels first and then to men. The Church is precisely this extension of the divine life to a multitude of creatures, not as a result of their own exertions to develop their religious sense or to lead a life similar to God's, but by the imparting to them of the very life of God itself, so that they actually share the life and participate in the purposes of God.[1]

---

[1] "L'unité de l'Eglise est une communication et une extension de l'unité même de Dieu. La vie qui est éternellement dans le sein du Père, après s'être communiquée en Dieu lui-même pour y constituter la société divine, celle

Thus the Church is "the community of those who are called to share the inheritance of the Father and the benefits of the covenant."[2] The covenant is the pact entered into by God with the human race through Abraham, Moses and finally and most perfectly through Christ. Those who share in this inheritance, participate in the very life of God and it is this *communio sanctorum* which is the Church:

> Hence the ground of the Church's existence is the communication to the many of the life of the Father. It is because there is only one God that there is only one Church, one with the very oneness of God, outside whom she does not exist. Because we participate in one life, which is the life of God, we are one with God and one among ourselves, in Christ. In the language of the Schoolmen, the life of God in glory and beatitude becomes, by grace, a "common good" pertaining to God and those whom He calls to share it. And this *bonum commune* constitutes a society absolutely unique, which is the Church.[3]

Fundamental here then is the understanding that it is the "divine life which is the principal cause of the Church and of

---

des Trois Personnes de la sainte Trinité, est, par grâce, communiquée aux creatures spirituelles, aux anges d'abord, puis à nous. C'est celà l'Eglise: l'extension de la vie divine à une multitude de créatures developpant ce qu'il y a en elles de 'religieux' et s'efforcant de mener une vie *à l'instar de* celle de Dieu; mais la même vie de Dieu la manière de vivre de Dieu, les objets de vie de Dieu donnés, communiqués a des créatures." M. J. Congar, *Crétiens désunis. Principes d'un'oecuménisme catholique* Paris (1937) 59. The English texts are based upon the English version of Congar's book (*Divided Christendom,* London, 1939).

[2] "L'Eglise est la communauté de ceux qui sont appelés à entrer en part de l'héritage du Père et des biens de l'Alliance." *Ibid.,* 62.

[3] "Ainsi, la raison pour laquelle il ya l'Eglise est la communication à plusieurs de la vie du Père. C'est parce qu'il y a un seul Dieu qu'il y a seule Eglise, une de l'unité même de Dieu et un entre nous (dans le Christ). On dirait, en termes de scolastique, que la vie glorieuse et beatifiante de Dieu devient, par grâce, un bien commun à Dieu et à tous ceux qu'il appelle à y communier; bien commun definissant une société d'une espère absolument unique et que est l'Eglise." *Ibid.,* 63-64.

its unity."[4] How is this life communicated to men? By what means do they become sharers in God's life? As God's life is itself a life of knowledge and love, so its communication to man is effected by means of knowledge and love. Because of man's limitations, this communication must be imperfect. Consequently the divine life is communicated imperfectly by faith; yet essentially by charity: "Faith and charity—faith informed by charity, are the living interior form and the immanent soul of the Church. By them and in them the life which is from the beginning in the bosom of the Father is extended to us, so that we live with Christ in God."[5]

In this broad view of the Church, God is seen as reaching out toward men to make them partakers of His life. He utilizes certain active principles or means to effect this communication and the Church is composed of all those men who are thus united in their sharing of the life of God:

> These realities—grace, with faith and charity—are active principles in us orientated towards the object of the life of God. Of themselves they tend, efficaciously because of Him who is their principle, towards the life-giving beatific mystery of God, in order to be united with Him and to possess and enjoy Him eternally. The Church is the community of souls living the very life which is the life of the Blessed Trinity because the object of their lives is the same as that of the life of God Himself.[6]

---

[4] "C'est ce que nous allons appliquer à mieux entendre en nous demandant ce que représente et comment se fait cette communication de vie divine qui est le principe premier de l'Eglise et de son unité." *Ibid.,* 64.

[5] "La foi et la charité, la foi 'informé' de charité sont la forme intérieure vivante et l'âme immanente de l'Eglise. Par elles et en elles, la vie qui est dès principe dans le sein du Père et qui est feconde dans le mystère de Dieu, se communique à nous et nous fait vivre. Avec le Christ, en Dieu, une vie qui est la vie famille du Père lui-même." *Ibid.,* 65.

[6] "Mais ces réalités, la grâce avec la foi et la charité sont en nous des principes de vie orientée vers les objets de vie de Dieu. Elles tendent elle-même et grâce au Saint-Esprit qui est leur principe, efficacement, à toucher le mystère vivant et béatifiant de Dieu pour s'unir à lui, le posséder et en jouir spirituellement. . . . L'Eglise est la communauté de ces âmes qui vivent une même vie qui est la vie trinitaire, parce que leur objet de vie est le même." *Ibid.,* 70.

Thus for Congar the Church is the family of God, composed of those who have become partakers of the divine life in grace, faith and charity. This sharing is effected through Christ. We are conformed to the life of God only in Christ. This is effected in the sacraments of the Christian dispensation, especially in baptism and the eucharist.

However there is another aspect to this oneness of the Church; there is the visible ecclesiastical structure. Man is a social being and so God has decreed that he should work out his salvation in the society of other men: "since our heavenly citizenship is prepared for and begun in humanity under a human mode, and not according to the mode of its realization in glory, we must expect to find a Church in the form of a Society, embodied in realities of sense; teaching, ruling, active and militant."[7] For this reason the Church which Congar has been describing has a definite social form:

> The Church *in via* is of necessity militant, it is also of necessity governed. And since God follows the law of our nature and deals with us in this world as men, as well as calling us to share His life, the Church on earth assumes the human and social form of any community of men bound together in pursuit of a common purpose. But the common purpose here is the fulfilling of Christ, who is our Peace.[8]

Henceforth salvation will be visited not upon an elect nation but upon individuals who are constituted a nation by their union with

---

[7] "Et donc, si vraiment la société de la Sainte Trinité se prépare et commence ici-bas dans l'humanité, non pas selon son mode de réalisation propre, homogène et connaturel—qui est la gloire—mais selon le mode d'être homogène et connaturel à cette humanité, il faudra nous attendre a avoir une Eglise de forme sociétaire, incarnée dans les réalités sensibles, enseignants, gouvernante, active et militante." *Ibid.,* 83.

[8] "L'Eglise pérégrinante est, necessairement militante; c'est aussi necessairement une Eglise gouvernée. Et, puisque Dieu suit la logique de notre nature et nous traite en hommes terrestres, tout en nous appelant à prendre part à sa vie interne, l'Eglise de la terre prendra la forme humaine et sociétaire de toute communauté d'hommes en mouvement pour la conquête d'un bien commune. Mais le 'bien commun,' ici, c'est l'accomplissement du Christ, qui est notre 'Paix' substantielle." *Ibid.,* 85.

Christ: "The individual is no longer blessed because he belongs to a people; but because he is in Christ by faith and baptism he belongs to the people of God, which is realized through incorporation and identification with Christ."[9] One very important conclusion from all this is that: "This saving incorporation with Christ and salvation in Him are only possible through membership of a group without which the faith would not be preached or the sacraments given; the Church is essentially apostolic or hierarchic."[10] At this point the author is most anxious to stress the importance he attaches to the visible society and remarks:

> But before going on, we must emphasize the significance in authentic Christianity of the external form of the Church's unity. In the light of what has already been said, the Church, as an institution, is the human form of the divine interior unity of the Church as the Mystical Body. . . . St. Paul and the early Fathers, as well as those of the fourth and fifth centuries, had no notion whatever of a Mystical Body which was not a definite and individual reality, identical with and indissociable from the apostolic Church. To break the unity of the institutional Church was, for them, to break the unity of the Mystical Body—or rather, since the heavenly unity of the Body cannot be broken—to be separated from it. For the unity of the one was the very form, on the human plane, of the other. . . .
>
> It follows inevitably that we must belong to the Church in order to belong to the Mystical Body and that the two, by right, coincide.[11]

---

[9] "C'est n'est plus en etant d'un peuple qu'on est beni de Dieu; c'est en étant au Christ par la foi et le baptême qu'on est constitué de son peuple. C'est très précisément en s'incorporant et en s'indentifiant au Christ qu'on réalise son peuple." *Ibid.,* 87.

[10] "Cette incorporation au Christ et ce salut en lui ne sont possibles que par le ministère d'un groupe sans lequel ni la foi qui justifie ne serait prêchée, ni les sacrements qui incorporant ne seraient donnés; l'Eglise est essentiellement apostolique ou, si l'on veut, hiérarchique." *Ibid.,* 88.

[11] "Mais avant d'aller plus loin, il nous faut affirmer la valeur, en christianisme authentique, de la forme extérieure d'unité de l'Eglise. En vertu l'unite intérieure toute divine de l'Eglise comme Corps mystique. . . . Aussi ni saint Paul ni les Pères les plus anciens, ni ceux de V^e^ et du VI^e^ siècle n'ont l'idée d'un Corps mystique qui ne serait pas un réalité bien definie et

Since there is this twofold dimension of the Church, there is also a twofold plane and a twofold law of unity which Congar describes in detail. One plane is the internal and its law of unity is the one divine life communicated to men; the other is the external plane and its law of unity is the regime of the visible structure. Under one aspect the Church is an organism, under the other, an organization. From one point of view the Church "has neither extension nor division, but is a living organism, simply and wholly realized where men are united with God."[12] From the other point of view the Church "has quantitative extension in the world, and distinct parts."[13] Nevertheless there is not and there never have been two Churches: "There is not, on the one hand, an invisible, disembodied, purely 'Mystical' Body, and on the other a lifeless corpse consisting of the external ecclesiastical organization. For that which is thus organized is precisely the human fellowship of the friends of God, and the Mystical Body is the ecclesiastical *societas* itself."[14] Furthermore, these two aspects of the Church are in no way opposed to one another. Rather one is the manifestation as well as the instrument of the other:

> As the body is the instrument and the manifestation of the soul, so the external and visible Church is the manifestation and the symbol, as well as the instrument, of

---

individuée, identique à l'uniqe Eglise apostolique et indissociable d'elle. Pour eux, brisser l'unité de l'Eglise-société, c'etait briser l'unité du Corps mystique —ou plutot puisque l'unité du Corps mystique communiquée d'en haut, ne saurait être brisée—c'etait se séparer du Corps mystique. Car l'unité de l'une était la forme même, au plan humain, de l'unité de l'autre. . . .

"Il ensuite, à coup sûr, qu'on doit appartenir à l'Eglise pour appartenir au Corps mystique et que les deux, de droit, se decouvrent." *Ibid.,* 92.

[12] "De ce point de vue, l'Eglise n'est ni étendu, ni divisée; c'est un organisme vivante qui est réalisé tout entier et simplement là où il y a des hommes unis a Dieu: c'est la Christ mystique." *Ibid.,* 99.

[13] "De ce point de vue, l'Eglise est une grandeur étendu dans le monde, et distincte dans ses parties." *Loc. cit.*

[14] "Il n'y a pas, d'un côté, une sorte de pûr corps mystique, communauté spirituelle des âmes, sans corps (precisément parce que les âmes ne sont pas sans corps) et d'un autre côté, une sorte de cadavre d'organization ecclésiastique; mais, ce qui est organisé, c'est la communauté humaine des amis de Dieu et ce qui est Corps mystique c'est la société ecclésiastique elle-même." *Ibid.,* 100.

> the invisible life of Christ which animates it. Its visible social organization serves to realize in space and time, to renew, to propagate, to conserve and to manifest the interior and invisible reality of the mystical fellowship of life in Christ. The Church as "Institution" is the instrument of the Church as "Mystical Body," and the two, so far from being antithetical, are organically united so as to form one single reality which is, purely and simply, "the Church."[15]

While it is true that the supernatural life is the more noble aspect of the Church, it must never be overlooked that "this supernatural life is acquired *through* the social and visible organism of the Church, and its acquisition is the sole purpose for the existence of the latter."[16]

This constitutes Congar's explanation of the twofold unity of the Church and he sums it up in one brief statement: "To sum up, the unity of the One, Holy, Catholic Church is that of a clearly defined entity consisting of human beings united by a supernatural life proceeding from God and from Christ, in an organized form of social life by means of which this supernatural life is initiated and fostered."[17]

In considering now the author's inquiry into the status of those who he calls "Our Separated Brethren," it is essential to bear in mind this concept of the twofold unity of the Church. The Church is the community of those who partake of the life of God, through faith and charity. The Church is God's communication of His life to men through and in Christ. This is the mystical element of the Church, the *Mystical Body;* but this coincides with the visible ecclesiastical structure, forming not two Churches, but one. In this one Church the external organization is the manifestation and the instrument of the internal living organism.

---

[15] "De même l'Eglise par ce qui est en elle visibilité, organisation et société, est à la fois l'expression ou la figure de ce qui est en elle vie et unité spirituelle dans le Christ, et l'instrument de cette vie. Sa réalité sociétaire et sensible sert à la constitution, au recrutement, à la propagation, à la conservation et finalement à l'expression de sa réalité intérieur de communauté mystique de vie dans le Christ. Ceci n'est ici-bas, (normalement) possible que par celà. L'Eglise institution est l'instrument organiquement associé de l'Eglise-Corps mystique, les deux étant une seule realité qui est, purement et simplement, l'Eglise du Christ." *Ibid.,* 103.

[16] "Or tout celà est procuré par l'organisme social et visible de l'Eglise, qui n'a pas d'autre raison d'être." *Loc. cit.*

[17] Au total, l'unité de l'Eglise une, sainte, catholique et apostolique, est celle d'une réalité très speciale faite d'hommes unis par une vie surnaturelle procédant de Dieu et du Christ en une forme de vie sociétaire par laquelle est procurée et promue cette vie surnaturelle elle-même." *Ibid.,* 108.

Congar's consideration of the status of "Our Separated Brethren," is made in chapter seven. His starting point is the statement that: "Christendom is more extensive than the visible reality of the Church."[18] This provides a firm point of departure, since it is an unassailable fact of experience. He writes: "This is a self-evident fact. Although for us the one and only Church is the visible Catholic Church, we know that outside her visible membership there are souls who belong to Jesus Christ. There are multitudes of the baptized and countless spiritual and holy souls in other Christian communions. We believe that even among the heathen there are members of the Mystical Body, predestined to eternal life."[19] This comes as a necessary conclusion if one accepts what has been said in chapter two concerning the unity of the Church. For there are non-Catholics in the world who are in the state of grace. If so, they must belong to the Mystical body and so to the Church which is the community of those united to God through participation of His life in Christ. Congar defends this viewpoint with the following:

> This implies no denial of the famous principle *Extra Ecclesiam, nulla salus*. Whatever meaning this or that Father or theologian in times past attached to this formula, which has often quite wrongly been made into a bugbear, it will not be denied by anyone that souls which do not visibly belong to the Church are none the less justified and saved, and hence incorporate in Christ. The Church is defined as the Body of Christ; these souls therefore

---

[18] "Le Christianisme depasse la réalité visible de l'Eglise." *Ibid.,* 278.

[19] "C'est un fait, Si, pour nous, l'Eglise, l'unique Eglise, est l'Eglise catholique, il-ya en dehors d'elle des âmes qui sont à Jesus-Christ: il y a des baptisés, il ya a même des âmes vraiment spirituelles et saintes dans les autres groupes chretiens; il y a même des sauvés et donc des membres du Corps mystique, parmi les 'infidèles.'" *Loc. cit.*

> must belong in some fashion to the Church, for having received grace they cannot be alien to the Mystical Body of the Lord.[20]

This conclusion can be ignored in any defense of the Church's claim only at the cost of denying the presence of any spiritual values in the non-Catholic world. Such a conclusion is unthinkable in the face of the obvious spiritual superiority of many Protestants over Catholics: "And, moreover, is not a sincere Protestant, believing, truly consecrated to God and living a holy life, more really a member of the Church than a baptized Catholic who is slack and sinful or has perhaps lost his faith altogether? In one sense, obviously, the answer is Yes."[21] But if this is true, how are we actually to conceive the nature and purpose of the Church? How are we to understand its part in the salvation of men? Before examining the situation in detail, the author proposes this preliminary solution:

> Only one answer seems logically possible. If we believe that the Catholic Church is the Church of Jesus Christ and veritably His Mystical Body, there is only one kind of recognition which we can, theologically speaking, accord to the Christian status of our separated brethren and the saved condition of the "good heathen," namely, the recognition that these are in fact our brethren and in some way members of the Catholic Church. That is a conclusion which we cannot evade.
>
> But before approaching the problem which results from the fact that Christendom, or the Mystical Body, is

---

[20] "Dire celà n'implique aucunement la negation du principe bien connu: *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.* Quel que soit, en effet, le sens que tel Père ou tel theologien à pu donner jadis à cette formule dont on s'est fait d'ailleurs souvent bien à tort un epouvantail, ce qui suit croyons-nous, ne sera nié par personne: des âmes qui ne sont pas dans l'Eglise visible sont cependant justifieés et sauvées; donc, incorporées au Christ. Des âmes, pour autant, appartiennent donc á l'Eglise, et ce quelles ont reçu de grâce n'est pas étranger à l'Eglise, qui est le Corps mystique du Seigneur." *Loc. cit.*

[21] "Et par ailleurs, un protestant sincère, croyant, vraiment consacré à Dieu et vivant saintement pour le Christ, n'est-il pas plus de l'Eglise qu'un catholique de baptême tiede ou pecheur, ou qui même, peut-être, a perdu la foi. Par un certain côté et en un certain sens, evidement oui." *Ibid.,* 279.

> not coterminous with the visible reality of the Church, we must try to throw light upon the fact itself.[22]

The basic reason for this difference in extension is the fact that there is a disproportion in the exercise by Christ Himself of the two prerogatives of His Priesthood and His Kingship. For the benefit of His priestly work of salvation through the cross, His kingly prerogatives are obscured. Here on earth Christ is a saving servant rather than a ruling king. Where Christ does rule on this earth

> . . . it is not in a Kingdom manifest in its perfection, but in an interior Kingdom, hidden, crucified and crucifying—the economy of salvation by the Cross and not of triumphant Kingship.
>
> The disunion of Christians is verily a rending of Christ and a continuance of His passion. But it also testifies, with the multitude of the saved to some of whom He is not even a name, that He came into the world to save it rather than dominate it. This is the reason, as it seems to us, why his saving reaches beyond the visible ark of salvation, the Catholic Church, and why the reality of His mercy as Savior surpasses the visible realm of His Kingship; why the Church, too, saves to a greater extent than she rules, and secretly incorporates more members than she can claim as subjects.[23]

With an understanding of this unequal extension, Congar examines the Church's attitude toward dissidents. He rejects the use of the terms *body* and *soul* since the distinction "does not seem theologically a very happy one, though imaginatively and verbally attractive."[24] However, it is not the basic concept he objects to, just the terminology; since "it is perfectly plain that in some way or other we must make the distinction which it implies and answer the question which it involves."[25] That distinction is to be made not in the Church itself but rather in the manner in which men belong to the Church. Thus men may belong to the Church "in a manner which may be either effective, plenary and visible (*re, numero et merito, corporaliter*); or imperfect, by desire, invisible and moral (*voto, mentaliter*)."[26] Trying to avoid technical details, Congar outlines two truths which are fundamental to the solution of the question of the relation of dissidents to the Church: "(1) Directly a soul is in any degree united to Christ it belongs by that very fact to the Church; or to put it another way, in it, by that very fact, the Church is realized, for the Church is nothing else than humanity reconciled with God in Christ. (2) The Church is not a simple thing of which one can say, as of an individual substance, that it is entirely present or entirely absent."[27] These truths are based upon the basic concept of the Church as explained in chapter two. There it was established that: "The Church is humanity reconciled with God in Christ. . . ."[28] That concept is recalled here by Congar and he adds that man's reconciliation with God is effected fully only in the Church since it is only there that the principles capable of reconciling man to God exist in an ordered fullness. Yet, although they exist in the Church in their fullness, an individual can be affected by only a portion of them. Consequently we are brought to the conclusion that there are varying degrees of membership in the Church:

---

[22] "Mais ayant constaté le declage qui existe entre le christianisme ou le Corps mystique et la réalité visible de l'Eglise, avant d'aborder le problême qui en result, it nous faut cherecher la raison d'un fait, per certains côtés, aussi paradoxal." *Loc. cit.*

[23] "Que la desunion des chrétiens, en ecartelant le Christ, continue sa passion, c'est certain. Mais elle contribue aussi avec la masse de hommes sauvés de qui pourtant, le Christ n'est pas encore connu, à temoigner qu'il est un sauveur-victîme et qu'il a été envoyé à notre monde plus pour le sauver que pour y regner. C'est pour celà nous semble-t-il que son action réelle de sauveur deborde l'oeuvre visible de salut, l'unique ârche sur les eaux mortelles, qu'est son Eglise catholique; que la réalité de son action misericordieuse de sauveur depasse son royaume visible et que l'Eglise elle aussi, sauve plus qu'elle ne triomphe et s'incorpore secretement plus de membres qu'elle ne peut denombrer de sujets." *Ibid.*, 280.

---

[24] "Mais surtout la distinction imaginativement et verbalement facile, du 'corps' et de 'l'âme' de l'Eglise ne nous parait pas théologiquement heureuse." *Ibid.,* 281.

[25] "Nous ne critiquons que le vocabulaire, car il est bien clair qu'il faut d'une manière ou d'une autre faire la distinction qu'il recouvre, et resoudre le problème qu'il denounce." *Loc. cit.*

[26] "On distinguait entre *esse numero tantum* et *esse numero et merito de Ecclesia,* ou encore être de l'Eglise *voto* ou *re,* ou enfin, comme equivalent de cette distinction, en matière sacramentaire, *mentaliter* (ou *invisibiliter*) et *corporaliter.*" *Ibid.,* 281-282.

[27] "1. Dès là qu'une âme est jointe de quelque manière au Christ, elle est pour autant de l'Eglise ou, si l'on veut, l'Eglise est, pour autant, realisée en elle: car l'Eglise n'est pas autre chose que l'humanité reconciliee avec Dieu dans le Christ.—2. L'Eglise n'est pas une chose simple dont on poisse dire, come on le peut d'une substance individuele simple, qu'elle est entièrement present ou tout à fait absente." *Ibid.,* 282.

[28] "L'Eglise, c'est l'humanité reconcilée avec Dieu dans le Christ." *Loc. cit.*

> There is a perfect membership in the Church—and so in Christ—in one who lives according to the principles of the new life of reconciliation with God which Christ has given to His Church. But there is imperfect membership in the Church, and in Christ, in one who lives only by one or other of the principles of the new life. It is because the benefits of the New Covenant are many that it is possible to belong to the Church in varying degree and so claim membership in it on various grounds.[29]

Again Congar's view seems to flow necessarily from his description of the twofold unity of the Church. This unity is effected internally by the communication of the divine life. God accomplishes this through the utilization of certain principles with which man may be affected in varying degrees and thus attain varying degrees of membership in the Church. So a validly baptized person who, in good faith, matures in a dissident Christian sect remains united to Christ and so "belongs truly to His Church."[30] At the same time it must be admitted that:

> . . . our dissident in good faith is never going to find in his sect or Church the sum total of those principles of life in Christ which are also the actualizing and unifying principles of the Church. Nevertheless, in so far as he does discover those principles, he is, by virtue of them, a member of the Church, that is, by his baptismal char-

---

[29] "Il y aura appartenance imparfaite a l'Eglise—et, pour autant, au Christ—quand on vivra selon l'un ou l'autre seulement des principes de vie nouvelle par quoi le Christ se constitue un peuple de reconcilies. C'est parce que les biens de la Nouvelle Alliance sont multiples qu'on peut être plus ou moins de l'Eglise et lui appartenir à des titre divers." *Ibid.,* 284.

[30] ". . . il adhère vaiment à son Eglise." *Ibid.,* 290.

> acter through grace and supernatural charity and sacramental graces . . . ; though not by an explicit profession of the true faith, a full sacramental life, or the inward inspiration of Catholic communion in faith and love, which, regulated by the Catholic hierarchy, is the ultimate seal of unity.[31]

In this way the Church includes members who seem to be outside her; though they belong to the Church invisibly, they really belong. In explaining their mode of belonging, Congar uses a second time, the terminology *in re* and *in voto*:

> They belong to the Church in so far as they belong to Christ, because what unites them to Christ is a fibre of His Mystical Body, a constituent element of His Church. The existence of this element apart from and outside the Church is indeed abnormal and untoward, for of its very nature it calls for integration in the one Body of Christ, at once visible and invisible, which is the Catholic Church. But if, through good faith, that element of the Church preserves at any rate the essential of its efficacy, it brings about in the soul of the dissident a spiritual incorporation (*voto*) in the Church, and tends increasingly to an entire and practical (*re*) incorporation in the ecclesiastical Catholic body.[32]

---

[31] "En tout cas, notre dissident suppose de bonne foi ne trouvera jamais dans sa secte ou son Eglise, la totalité des principes de vie-avec-le-Christ qui sont aussi les principe de realisation et d'unité de l'Eglise. En cependant, pour autant qu'il trouvera de ces principes, il sera, par eux, un membre de l'Eglise; il le sera par son caractere baptismal, par la grâce, par la foi surnaturele, par le charité, par les graces sacramentelles . . . il ne le sera pas par une profession expresse de la vraie foi, par une pleine vie sacramentelle, par cette animation intériéure de la communion catholique de foi, d'amour, d'entr'aide fraternelle, qui, reglée par la hiérarchie apostolique, est le sceau dernier de l'unité." *Ibid.,* 292.

[32] "Ils sont à elle pour autant qu'ils sont au Christ, car ce qui les unit au Christ est une fibre de son Corps mystique, un élément constitutif de son Eglise. Qu'un tel élément existe, de quelque manière, en dehors de l'Eglise, c'est là une situation anormale et violente; et l'appelle, de sa nature, son integration complète dans l'unique Corps du Christ, à la fois invisible et visible, qu'est l'Eglise catholique, mais si, en raison d'une bonne foi qui est la condition de tout, il garde l'essentiel au moins de son efficicité, il produit dans cette âme son effet d'incorporation en la communion du peuple de

A serious objection may be raised against such a viewpoint: "By attributing to the Church all that there is of Christianity, it may be said . . . that we reduce the Church to no more than the company of the just, and do away with the need for it. . . ."[33] Facing this objection, Congar denies that his theory does the slightest injury to the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. That necessity is explained by the theologians as one of both precept and means. It is upon the affirmation of this doctrine that Congar builds his explanation: "Therefore, just because it is not possible to be saved without effective membership in the Church, or to receive the Holy Ghost apart from her, it has to be said that any soul, in error but in good faith, really belongs to the Church, as we have explained."[34] Further no encouragement is given to the error of indifferentism; for in any event the necessity of precept still remains. We are not excused from this necessity in spite of the fact that "God in His mercy extends the vital efficacy of the Church's ministry beyond the visible bounds of the ecclesiastical body. . . ."[35]

He also denies that his explanation reduces the Church merely to the assembly of the just. In so doing he touches once more upon a concept which explains the whole process of the salvation of non-Catholics; namely that there are in dissident sects *some* of the means of attaining union with God. It remains true, of

---

la Nouvelle Alliance: il produit effectivement une incorporation spirituelle (voto) à l'Eglise et tend de tout son poids vers une incorporation totale et sensible (re) au corps ecclésiastique catholique." *Loc. cit.*

[33] ". . . car, puisqu'on ramène à l'Eglise, qui n'est plus que l'assemblée des justes, et l'on detruit sa necessité." *Ibid.,* 294.

[34] "Cependant, precisement parce qu'on ne peut être sauvé sans une appartenance effective à l'Eglise, ni recevoir le Saint-Esprit en dehors d'elle, il faut dire que tout homme se trouvant, de réele bonne foi, dans l'erreur, appartient réellement a l'Eglise: c'est ce que nous avons expliqué dans ce chapitre." *Loc. cit.*

[35] "Que Dieu, dans sa miséricorde, étende l'efficacité vivifiante du ministère de l'Eglise au delà des limites visibles du corps ecclésiastique. . . ." *Loc. cit.*

course, that these principles exist in their fullness only in the Church. He says, in defense of his theory:

> We do not say that the Church, in her unity, is *merely* the community of men whom God has justified because of their righteousness and obedience. What we do say is that the unity of the Church is an organic whole of all the principles by which God unites us to Himself as one people: that some of these principles may be found and be effective outside the visible institution which is the true Church, but also that the ultimate principles of unity, the seal of our communion with God, are found inalienable in the only Bride of Christ, and that even the most saintly dissidents are deprived of them.[36]

There is one final aspect of Congar's exposition which must be mentioned before bringing this summary of his exposition to a close. It is his view toward the very Christian bodies themselves. He sees them as elements of the true Church: ". . . it would seem to the present writer that the various dissident Christian bodies, each in very varying degree, may be regarded in some fashion as *elements* of the Church: elements, that is to say, to the extent in which they have preserved in their very constitution as a religious body elements or principles which pertain to the integral reality of the One Church."[37] It is the combination of these "elements of the Church" and the grace of God which effects the salvation of those dissidents who are in good faith.

It is very difficult to analyze and assess the value of Congar's words. His explanation would seem to expand the concept of Church in order to include dissidents of good faith, whereas the historical approach of the theologians has sought to establish an attachment with the visible ecclesiastical structure without dilating that structure in the slightest. Even his use of the *in re-in voto* distinction seems to be sharply different from the historical use of these terms.

---

[36] "Car nous ne disons nullement que l'Eglise, dans son unité, soit la pure communauté des hommes que Dieu, en raison de leur droiture et de leur obéissance, a justifiés. Mais nous disons que l'unité de l'Eglise est une plenitude organiques de tous les principes par quoi Dieu nous unit avec lui, tous en un saul peuple; que plusieurs des ces principes peuvent se trouver et agir en dehors de l'institution visible qui est la vraie Eglise; mais aussi que les principes dernièrs de l'unité de celle-ci, le sceau de notre commonion en Dieu se trouvent inaliénablement auprès de l'unique Epouse du Christ, et que les dissidents même les plus saints en seront toujours privés." *Ibid.*, 295.

[37] ". . . on peut cependant, nous semble-t-il, dire d'elles qu'elles sont à des degrés divers d'ailleurs, des éléments de l'Eglise. Elles sont des éléments de l'Eglise dans la mesure ou elles ont plus ou moins gardé, dans ce qui constitue leur réalité sociologique comme corps religieux, des éléments ou des principes réalisateurs de l'Eglise une." *Ibid.*, 302.

Congar stresses the internal aspect of the Church, so as to define the Church in terms of that interior reality. The Church "is the community of souls living the very life which is the life of the Blessed Trinity. . . ." Membership in this Church is gained through the possession of sanctifying grace. This description of the internal unity of the Church illuminates the great mystery and purpose of the Church: the gathering together of all men in a sharing of the life of God in and through Christ. Since the constitutive element of the Church so-considered is the communication of the divine life, there necessarily remains something nebulous, something invisible about this whole concept of Church. The internal, spiritual aspect is one of almost unimaginable importance; every element in this description points to the conclusion that this Church is merely an invisible one.

However the only way to draw such a destructive inference from this explanation is to disregard Congar's insistence that the internal and external aspects of the Church are identified. There are not two Churches, but one. "The Church as an institution is the human form of the divine interior unity of the Church as the Mystical Body. . . . The Church as 'Institution' is the instrument of the Church as 'Mystical Body,' and the two, so far from being antithetical, are organically united so as to form one single reality which is purely and simply 'the Church.' "

Yet when closer examination is given to the two concepts which are said to constitute one single reality, it becomes evident that the theologian is going to experience considerable difficulty in conceptualizing a Church which will unite the divergent elements present in Congar's two-level consideration. There is an unequal extension of the two; membership in one is gained by the possession of grace; membership in the other, by simple adherence to an external regime, which may be accomplished without possessing grace. The root difficulty lies in the very concepts which

Congar unites. On the one hand, considering the internal unity of the Church, the Church is verified wherever the life of God is present. It extends to include all those who are in possession of this divine life. Where such union with God is not effected, there is no Church since the Church is "the family of God constituted by the communication to mankind of the divine life in grace, faith and charity. . . ." On the other hand, the external unity of the Church is not so dependent upon the very presence of the life of God. Certainly it is meant to impart that life; but in itself it does not cease to exist if that life is not present. A person may be a member of the Church considered in this sense, without possessing grace. It would seem then that in addition to over emphasizing the internal aspect and reality of the Church, Congar has also attempted to reconcile two separate meanings of the word "Church." According to the ultimate realities involved and from the total viewpoint of the aim and purpose of its earthly existence, the Church may be described as the "community of souls living the very life of the Blessed Trinity." But it should be recognized that such is a *broad* use of the term; that in point of fact there is no such existing society definable in these precise terms. Without such a realization, the above definition of the Church is simply false. The true Church of Christ is not definable in these terms. Such a description is legitimate in the interests of probing the realities involved; and always with the understanding that such a use of the term "Church" is a wide, non-technical use. This measure of liberty is accorded writers solely to avoid eternal quibbling about words.

The strict definition of the Church of Christ is given, however, not in terms of the invisible reality, but in terms of the external, visible structure; the Church is: "the society of men living in this world, professing the true religion of Christ, under the rule and infallible teaching authority of the bishops and particularly of the Roman Pontiff. It was instituted by Christ himself for the attainment of eternal salvation and it is destined to last forever."[38] This constitutes a strict, scientific definition of the Church. It would seem necessary to conclude that this strict definition and the wide definition used above are to be carefully distinguished at all times. Yet Congar unites them.

---

[38] "Societas hominum viatorum, veram Christi religionem profitentium . . . sub regimine et infallibili magisterio espicoporum ac praecipue Romani Pontificis, a Christo ipso in perpetuum instituta ad salutem aeternam consequendam." J. M. Hervé, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* (Paris 1952) I.269.

This attempt to unite concepts which are radically incompatible can result only in a hopeless confusion. This becomes apparent when the author comes to explain the status of our separated brethren. For there he is forced to accept as a starting point the fact that "Christendom or the Mystical Body is not coterminous with the visible reality of the Church. . . ." He has apparently abandoned his attempt to identify his two views of the Church. His earlier insistence that these two entities coincide seems to be replaced by this later realization that they simply do not. This will have serious effect upon his explanation of the salvation of non-Catholics, for it will inevitably place outside the visible Church, a segment of the Mystical Body, with power to impart life itself. Ultimately Congar comes to just such a statement, asserting that the salvation of non-Catholics may be effected through "a fibre of His Mystical Body, a constituent element of His Church" which is separated from the visible ecclesiastical body. This is the view of Adam and Karrer.

Congar attempts to explain the salvation of non-Catholics by appealing to these "fibres" which exist apart from and outside the Church, and to efficacious principles operative "outside the visible institution which is the true Church." The totality of these principles uniting a man to God are found in the Roman Catholic Church; but these principles may be found in varying degrees in dissident groups and by means of these a man may be saved. The process of salvation is thus initiated through union with Christ and because of this union the individual is united to the Church; further, he states "by that very fact the Church is realized, for the Church is nothing else than humanity reconciled with God in Christ." The Church is not a simple substance; it is not easy to say that it is entirely present or entirely absent.

Now we cannot but conclude that the term "Church" here is being used in the broad sense. So when Congar says that a dissident who discovers the unifying principles of the Church in his own sect becomes "by virtue of them, a member of the Church," he does not mean that he becomes a member of the Church considered as the visible Roman Catholic Church; but a member of the Church considered as the "community of those sharing the life of the Blessed Trinity." In explaining how salvation comes to this person in and through the Church he is changing the concept of Church as it has been traditionally understood in regard to this doctrine.

This particular use of the term Church becomes a bit more clear in his description of how such people are related to the Church. He writes:

> They belong to the Church in so far as they belong to Christ, because what unites them to Christ is a fibre of His Mystical Body, a constituent element of His Church. The existence of this element apart from and outside the Church is indeed abnormal and untoward, for of its very nature, it calls for integration in one Body of Christ, at once visible and invisible, which is the Catholic Church. But if, through good faith, that element of the Church preserves at any rate the essential of its efficacy, it brings about in the soul of the dissident a spiritual incorporation (*voto*) in the Church, and tends increasingly to an entire and practical (*re*) incorporation in the ecclesiastical Catholic body.[39]

Here his use of the terms *voto* and *re* is not the historical use of these terms. For here *voto* signifies a spiritual incorporation into the Church *considered as the society of those living the life of God;* as such it is reducible to the possession of sanctifying grace. The term *re* means only that these people in the state of grace tend toward incorporation in the ecclesiastical Catholic body. Thus the terms *voto* and *re* are used in reference to different realities. The more important reality is the "Church" understood in the broad sense. The causative role of the Roman Catholic Church in the process of salvation is greatly minimized if not totally obliterated. It is of little help to recall that the two realities had been identified in an earlier chapter. Here they are obviously used in opposition and can scarcely be called aspects of the same reality for the reasons recorded above.

---

[39] Y. M. J. Congar, *op. cit.*, 292.

To conclude then, it is possible to discern a few original facets in Congar's explanation. First and foremost the Church is given both a wide and a strict meaning. Since these two meanings are interchanged throughout his treatment, considerable confusion is created. The internal aspect of the Church is greatly emphasized, sometimes at the expense of the visible ecclesiastical structure. The opinion of Adam and Karrer regarding the Catholic element in non-Catholic religions is incorporated here; it is even somewhat expanded in as much as the non-Catholic bodies are regarded as "elements of the Church." The process of salvation for non-Catholics is described as consisting in the interaction of these "fibres" of the Mystical Body and the grace of God. This is what saves individuals; union with the Church is thus a consequence and not a cause of salvation.

This treatment by Congar represents an advance in the depth of the consideration both of the process of salvation of non-Catholics; and the role played by those elements in non-Catholic religions which seem to have a valid merit. However if the prerogatives of the Roman Catholic Church are to be safeguarded there is need of elaboration and considerable clarification of many of the elements of Congar's treatment.

2. H. DE LUBAC

Chapter seven of Henri de Lubac's *Catholicisme* is entitled "Salvation Through the Church." It represents a partial reproduction of a report read to the Congress of the Missionary Union of the Clergy at Strasbourg in 1933; it appeared in print as chapter seven of *Catholicisme* in 1938. Since the circulation of the first publication was limited and since the material was at least partially re-worked for its second appearance, it seems more accurate to consider this work here in 1938.

De Lubac's main concern in this section is to show how all who are saved, but especially "un-believers," are saved only through the Church. His immediate conclusion in regard to the great horde of men who never come into contact with the Christian dispensation is that: "there is no man, no 'unbeliever,' whose supernatural conversion to God is not possible from the dawn of reason onwards."[40]

However, this at once poses a serious problem. For Christ went to great pains to found a Church and to command his apostles to propagate his law and his society. "He declared that faith in his person and membership in his Church were necessary to salvation."[41] How can we reconcile this with the "salvation of unbelievers?" Does not the doctrine of universal salvific will of God lessen the force of the doctrine of the Church's necessity?

> Now if every man can be saved, in principle at least and at whatever hazard, what reason is there for this Church? Is it merely for the purpose of obtaining a better, more certain salvation for a small number of privileged souls? Or if it be supposed that her presence in the world is necessary in order that grace, which reposes by right in her alone, should be poured out all around her and attain in mysterious fashion the souls even of those who know her not, how can we account for the demand that has been reiterated for the past two thousand years calling for her expansion as the most urgent of all tasks? In any case, how can it still be claimed that the Church is a vital necessity?[42]

When salvation is made available to all who are termed "unbelievers" what becomes of the necessity of belonging to the Church? Is it not dimmed to such an extent that it entirely vanishes? It is by no means enough to answer that the Catholic is in a better position; that he possesses so many aids that the difference between him and the un-believer is considerable: "For if this difference, which no one calls in doubt, is only a matter of 'more' or 'less,' how is it to be understood that, though strictly speaking the 'less' suffices, yet the 'more' should be required? Of course it is always unwise not to choose the most favorable conditions and it is foolish to neglect the means to a fuller life; but it can never be a crime."[43] In short, the question which must be answered is this: If an implicit Christianity is sufficient for the salvation of one who knows no other, why should we go in quest of an explicit one?

---

[40] "Il n'est pas un homme, pas un 'infidèle' dont la conversion surnaturelle à Dieu ne soit possible dès le seuil de sa vie raisonnable." H. de Lubac, *Catholicisme,* 4 ed. (Paris 1947) 181.

[41] "Il a déclaré que la foi en sa Personne et l'aggrégation a son Église étaient la conditions du salut." *Ibid.,* 182.

[42] "Or, si tout homme peut, au moins à la rigeur et de façon si précaire que ce soit, se sauver, pourquoi cette Église? Son rôle serait-il donc seulement de procurer un salut meilleur ou plus assuré à un petit nombre de privilégiés? ou, si l'on suppose que sa présence est nécessaire dans le monde pour que la grace dont elle est en droit l'unique dépositaire rejaillisse mystérieusement autour d'elle sur ceux-là mêmes qui l'ignorent, pourquoi du moins, incessamment renouvelé depuis vingt siècles, cet appel à son expansion comme à la tâche urgente entre toutes? En tout hypothèse, comment prétendre encore que la nécessité de l'Église soit absolument vitale?" *Loc. cit.*

Several facts must be taken into consideration, primary among them being the fact of the solidarity of the human race. We all are bound together by the same fundamental nature and the same destiny. The human race forms one body of which we are all members. If the members are saved it is because the body itself is saved. Therefore we find a portion of the explanation in the fact that the whole body, the whole human race of which all men are members, receives salvation through the Church:

> But salvation for this body, for humanity, consists in its receiving the form of Christ, and that is possible only through the Catholic Church. For is she not the only complete, authoritative interpreter of Christian revelation? Is it not through her that the practice of the evangelical virtues is spread throughout the world? And, lastly, is she not responsible for realizing the spiritual unity of men in so far as they will lend themselves to it? Thus this Church, which as the invisible Body of Christ is identified with final salvation, as a visible and historical institution is the providential means of this salvation.[44]

---

[43] "Car si cette différence, que nul ne met en doute, n'était malgré tout que du plus au moins, comment concevoir que, le moins suffisant à la rigeur, on fût néanmoins obligé au plus? Certes, c'est toujours imprudence que de ne pas choisir les conditions les plus favorables, et c'est folie que de négliger le moyen de vivre en plénitude: mais ce ne saurait être un crime." *Ibid.*, 183.

[44] "Mais le salut pour ce corps—pour l'humanité—consiste à recevoir la forme du Christ, et celà ne se peut que par le moyen de l'Église catholique. Celle-ci n'est-elle pas, en effet, la seule messagère intégrale et autorisée de

Now outside of Christianity—"the providential means" of salvation—all is not darkness. There are countless specks of light which are the "elements of real religion which ennoble the cults of even the most inferior peoples."[45] These elements are by no means corrupt; but they do remain in great danger of going astray, of being lost: "Outside Christianity, nothing attains its end, that sole end, towards which, unknowingly, all human desires, all human endeavors, are in movement, the embrace of God in Christ. The most admirable, the most vigorous of these endeavors needs—absolutely—to be impregnated with Christianity if it is to bear its eternal fruit. . . ."[46] There is need of the Church, "the historic, visible, hierarchic Church . . . to transform and complete human endeavor. . . ."[47] Though it is true that these elements, this human endeavor needs the Church, it is also true that the Church needs, or at least is benefited by, them.

For we must remember that the Church was not suddenly thrust upon mankind. Thousands of years of preparation were needed for "Christ's revelation to be received of men. . . ."[48] All these specks of light scattered throughout all the religions of the world all played a role in accomplishing this preparation. This should not surprise us, for "since nature had to produce an unbelievably

---

la Révélation chrétienne? N'est-ce point par elle que se répand dans le monde la pratique des vertus évangéliques? N'est-ce pas elle, enfin, qui a charge de réaliser, pour autant qu'ils s'y prêteront, l'unification spirituelle do tous les hommes? Ainsi cette Eglise, qui en tant que Corps invisible du Christ s'identifie au salut final, en tant qu'institution visible et historique est le moyen providentiel de ce salut." *Ibid.,* 184-185.

[45] ". . . les éléments de religion authentique qui ennoblissent jusqu'au culte des populations les plus méprisées." *Ibid.,* 183.

[46] "Hors du christianisme, rien n'arrive à son Terme, à l'unique Terme où tendent sans le savoir tous les désirs humains, tous les efforts humains, et qui est l'étreinte de Dieu dans le Christ. Les plus beaux et les plus puissant de ces efforts ont donc absolument besoin d'être fécondés par le christianisme pour produire leur fruit d'éternité. . . ." *Ibid.,* 186.

[47] "Mais si l'Église—l'Église historique, l'Eglise visible et hiérarchique—est ainsi necessaire pour transformer et achever l'effort humain, elle-même n'est point achevée." *Ibid.,* 188.

[48] ". . . ainsi pour que la Révélation du Christ pût un jour être *reçue* par les hommes, et la divine Ressemblance briller de tout son éclat dans les yeux des saints, a-t-il fallu des préparations millénaires." *Ibid.,* 192.

extravagant profusion of living species so that in the end the human body could appear, we must not be astonished at the strange multiplicity of the forms of religion, before or outside Christianity, shown to us in history."[49] All of these forms of religion were in a sense necessary preludes to the crystallization of the social phenomenon we call Christianity. Since they supplied a need, they have a place in the economy of salvation:

> For since a necessary function in the history of our salvation was fulfilled by so great a mass of "unbelievers"—not indeed in that they were in formal error or in a state of degradation, but in that there is to be found in their beliefs and consciences a certain groping after the truth, its painful preparation or its partial anticipation, discoveries of the natural reason and tentative solution—so these unbelievers have an inevitable place in our humanity, a humanity such as the fall and the promise of a Redeemer have made it.[50]

Thus unbelievers have actually done and continue to do service for Christ; they have, in so far as they have tried to diffuse the small light they possess, made ready for the approach of the day when the full light of Christ would shine upon mankind. Such efforts do not go unrewarded:

> As "unbelievers" are, in the design of providence, indispensable for building the Body of Christ, they must in their own way profit from their vital connexion with this same Body. By an extension of the dogma of the

---

[49] "Et puisque la Natûre a dû produire une incroyable exubérance de formes vitales pour que pût apparaître un jour le corps humain, ne nous étonnons pas de l'étrange multiplicité des formes religieuses que nous découvre l'histoire avant le christianisme ou en dehors de lui." *Ibid.,* 193.

[50] "Puisqu'une si grande masse d'infidèles, non sans doute par ce qu'il y a chez eux d'erreur formelle ou de dégradation, mais par ce qu'on observe dans leurs institutions et dans leurs consciences de recherche, d'élaboration pénible, d'anticipations partielles, de justes inventions naturelles et de solutions encore imparfaites, ont eu à remplir dans l'histoire de notre salut une fonction nécessaire, c'est qu'ils tiennent dans notre humanité, dans cette humanité telle que l'ont faite à la fois la chute et la promesse du Rédempteur, une place inévitable." *Loc. cit.*

> communion of saints, it seems right to think that though they themselves are not in the normal way of salvation, they will be able nevertheless to obtain this salvation by virtue of those mysterious bonds which unite them to the faithful. In short, they can be saved because they are an integral part of that humanity which is to be saved.[51]

Yet we must never lose sight of the fact that all this is true and valid, not in itself, but only in relation to another truth. For these "specks of light" can bring men to salvation only because there exists separately in the world the full light of Christ which illumines the world. It is always because of and in relation to that light that men are saved:

> Although in certain cases the "less" seems to suffice—to return to the terms in which our original objection was formulated—the "more" exists and supplies what is lacking that this "less" can suffice, that the "insufficient can be sufficient." More precisely still, there is presupposed not only the restricted precarious presence of this "more" somewhere in the world, but its unrestricted growth and its definitive completion, though in a form that to us remains mysterious.[52]

So it is true that these unbelievers, while apparently having no connection with the Church are bound to her by invisible ties by virtue of which they are saved through the Church.

---

[51] "Providentiellement indispensables à l'édification du Corps du Christ, les 'infidèles' doivent bénéficier à leur manière des échanges vitaux de ce Corps. Par une extension du dogme de la communion des saints, il semble donc juste de penser que bien qu'ils ne soient pas eux-mêmes placés dans les conditions normales du salut, ils pourront néanmoins obtenir ce salut en vertu des liens mystérieux qui les unissent aux fidèles. Bref, ils pourrent être sauvés parce qu'ils font partie intégrante de l'humanité qui sera sauvée." *Ibid.,* 194.

[52] "Bien que—pour reprendre les termes où se formulait l'objection d'où nous sommes partis—en certains cas le 'moins' semble suffire, le 'plus' révélé reste rigoureusement nécessaire: car precisement, si ce 'moins' suffit alors, si l'insuffisant suffit,' c'est que le 'plus' existe, et supplée. Et plus précisément encore, celà suppose non pas seulement la presence limitée et precaire de ce 'plus' quelque part dans le monde, mais sa croissance sans limite et—sous une forme pour nous mystérieuse—son achèvement définitif." *Loc. cit.*

De Lubac maintains that it is only against the background of all these facts that the statement "outside the Church there is no salvation" can be understood. The explanation utilizing the distinction between the body and soul of the Church "is neither sufficient nor entirely exact."[53] The explanation taken from Suarez which says one must adhere to the "catholic communion *voto saltem ac desiderio*" appears to be "incomplete."[54] De Lubac is convinced that such explanations can be understood only in the light of the facts he has outlined: ". . . these explanations [the two mentioned above] take on again their true force and can be used without danger once it is recognized, by interpreting them collectively, that, for humanity taken as a whole, there can be no salvation outside the Church, that this is an absolute necessity, and a necessary means to which there can be no exceptions."[55] Thus there is no reason why the statement of the Church's necessity should anger anyone. There is no reason why we cannot change the negative statement into a positive one and express it as follows: "It is by the Church and by the Church alone that you will be saved."[56]

This represents the essence of the explanation of Henri de Lubac. He sums it up in the following paragraph:

> Of course the method of this salvation will differ according to whether the unbeliever has or has not encountered the Church. In the second case the only condition on which his salvation is possible is that he should

---

[53] "Mais une telle explication, qui a trouvé sa formule en ces dernièrs siècles dans la distinction entre le corps et l'âme de l'Église n'est si suffisante ni pleinement exacte." *Ibid.,* 196.

[54] "Incomplète encore, nous semble-t-il, l'explication empruntée à Suarez, d'après laquelle il faut, pour être sauvé, se trouver present au moins de coeur et de volonté implicite dans la communion catholique, *voto saltem ac desiderio." Loc. cit.*

[55] "Tandis que ces explications reprennent toute leur valeur et peuvent être adoptées sans périls, une fois que, par une interprétation collective, on a reconnu qu'il ne pouvait y avoir pour l'humanité prise en bloc aucun salut hors de l'Église, que c'était la une necéssité rigoureuse, une necéssité de moyen dont rien ne saurait dispenser." *Loc. cit.*

[56] ". . . c'est par l'Eglise, par l'Eglise seule que vous serez sauvé." *Ibid.,* 197.

> be already a Catholic as it were by anticipation, since the Church is the "natural place" to which a soul amenable to the suggestions of grace spontaneously tends. The "less" is then sufficient—to employ the expression for the last time—not in itself, of its own worth, but in so far as it aspires to the "more" in so far as it is ready to be lost in this "more" directly the exterior obstacles which hide the "more" from it are removed. Far different is the case of the unbeliever who comes in contact with the Church—as long as she is shown to him in her true likeness, he has a strict obligation actually to enter her fold. For if in truth, by the very logic of his correspondence with grace, he already aspires to her in secret, he would deceive himself if he shirked answering her summons. Those who do not know the Church are saved by her, therefore, in such a way that they incur the obligation of belonging to her even outwardly directly they come to know her.[57]

Such an abstract solution as de Lubac's should not be criticized for what it does not purport to be: a complete and exhaustive treatment of the necessity of the Church. In the introduction, the author remarks: ". . . I' hope that no reader will be deceived into thinking that I undervalue what I have had to pass over in silence."[58] Nevertheless it is legitimate, as well as necessary, to call attention to several remarks which seem to require further precision; furthermore there are certain elements that can scarcely be omitted from any consideration of this doctrine.

---

[57] "La modalité de ce salut sera, bien entendu, toute différente selon que l'infidèle aura ou non rencontré l'Église sur son chemin. Dans le second cas, la seule condition de salut est pour lui d'être déjà catholique comme par anticipation, l'Église étant le 'lieu naturel' où tend spontánement l'âme docile aux suggestions de la grâce. Le 'moins' suffit alors—pour reprendre une dernière fois cette expression—non pas en lui-même, par sa valeur propre, mais en tant qu'il aspire au 'plus' en tant qu'il serait prêt à se perdre dans ce 'plus' dès que les obstacles extérieurs qui le lui cachent viendraient à être levés. Tout autre est le cas de l'infidèle qui se trouve mis en face le l'Eglise—pourvu que celle-ci lui soit présentée sous son vrai visage. C'est pour lui une obligation stricte d'y entrer effectivement. Car si vraiment par la logique de sa correspondance à la grâce, il y aspirait dejà en secret, il se mentirait maintenant à lui-même en se dérobant à son appel. Ceux qui ne connaissent pas l'Église sont donc sauvés par elle de telle manière que l'obligation leur incombe de lui appartenir même extérieurement des qu'ils viennent à la connaître." *Loc. cit.*

[58] ". . . et nous espérons que nul lecteur ne s'y trompera, pensant que nous méconnaissons ce qu'il nous faillait passer sous silence." *Ibid.,* xiv.

First, de Lubac's explanation accounts only for the fact that unbelievers are saved through the Church. It does not indicate that they are also saved within the Church. Since the time of the Vatican Council, it has been accepted that salvation can come to a man only *per ecclesiam* and *in ecclesia.* Theologians have exerted no little effort in attempting to illuminate the second of these conditions. De Lubac has, in effect, separated the two elements by interpreting the word "extra" in the sense of "apart from" rather than "outside of." This is a rather serious limitation of the doctrine involved. While this view has certainly been met often enough in the theologians of the century, it has always been joined to a consideration of how this salvation is effected, in at least some way, *in ecclesia.*

Secondly, the Church is represented as being prepared for and anticipated by the "discoveries of natural reason and tentative solutions." This should be developed further so as to remove any appearance of syncretism. It would be alien to the Catholic concept of Church to view the society founded by Christ as one in the process of an evolution destined to culminate in a definitive form which is as yet unknown to us.

Thirdly, while non-Catholics who are saved are saved through the Church, their union with the Church seems to flow from their membership in the human race, rather than from any personal dispositions. It is because they provide a necessary preparation for the Church and because they are the necessary raw material for building the body of Christ that they have a "vital connexion with this same body." The fundamental reason why they can attain salvation is because "they are an integral part of humanity which is to be saved." So the doctrine of the necessity of the Church is given a collective interpretation. The Church is necessary for the salvation of humanity taken as a whole. This is a very different explanation from that advanced by the theologians who, since the time of the Vatican Council, have clung to the assertion that the Church is necessary for every individual; that he must either be a member of the Church or united with it in some way; this union was so described that it rested ultimately upon personal dispositions, not upon the performance of a social function in the work of salvation. So de Lubac's view is original in two respects; he interprets the doctrine collectively rather than personally; union with the Church, for him, rises from the collective fulfillment of a social function in the work of salvation, not from personal dispositions.

Finally, in regard to the "elements of real religion which enoble the cults of even the most inferior peoples," de Lubac seems to have presented a somewhat original explanation of their efficacy. These elements are incomplete, unable to attain their end. They must be impregnated with Christianity if they are to bear eternal fruit. Still these elements can be conducive to salvation; not of themselves, but in so far as they fulfill a social function; in so far as they prepare for, and to a certain extent, anticipate the coming of the Church. These "elements of real religion" to which the author refers as "the less" can function in a salvific way only because of the presence in the world of the "more" which is the Church. "The less" really presupposes the existence and the constant and unrestricted growth of the "more." Thus it is always in relation to the Church that salvation comes; it is really through the Church that these unbelievers attain salvation.

3. AUTHORS FROM DE LUBAC TO THE ENCYCLICAL MYSTICI CORPORIS CHRISTI

The most important event in the history of twentieth century Ecclesiology was the issuing of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*. Between the present stage of our inquiry (1938) and the date of the encyclical (1943), there are several authors whose views warrant exposition.

In 1938 John Gruden published a study entitled *The Mystical Christ*. Therein he speaks briefly of the Church's necessity for salvation. He first rejects several familiar explanations such as the body-soul explanation, the sufficiency of good faith and the *re-voto* solution. He comments: "It is certain that the theory which accounts for their [non-Catholics] salvation by making them belong to the soul of the Church is both psychologically and theologically inaccurate and therefore untenable."[59] He continues:

> Some have attempted to explain it . . . by affirming that no reference need be made to the soul of the Church. It suffices to say . . . that those outside the Church who are invincibly and inculpably ignorant of its divine mission are saved because they are in good faith. . . . Or again, some suggest, the axiom simply means that it is not necessary to belong to the body of the Church by necessity of means but only by necessity of precept. . . . Another theory sets up the distinction between membership by desire (*in voto*) as a possible basis of correct interpretation. All these and similar interpretations of the axiom add to the already existing confusion.[60]

Appealing to the schema prepared for the Vatican Council, Gruden views the Church as the ordinary way of salvation. God has extraordinary ways which, in His mercy He may substitute for the Church: "If those outside the Church are to be saved (and we have no reason to doubt that many are saved), they are saved not *in* and *through* the Church, but because God the Father has in His unbounded mercy provided some other means by which such men may come to Him, yet come to Him 'through Christ our Lord.' "[61]

The author considers Bainvel nearest to a correct solution. He agrees with Bainvel that the Church is the ordinary way of salvation and the "exceptional cases, be they ever so numerous" are taken care of by an "extraordinary economy."[62]

Father Gruden's explanation seems to be in effect a denial of the doctrine. He rejects not only the body-soul explanation, but also the *re-voto* solution, even though this latter was, by 1938, almost common among the theologians. To say that some men are saved "not *in* and *through* the Church, but because God the Father has in his unbounded mercy provided some other means by which such men may come to Him" is a denial of the forceful statement made over and over again by the theologians, as well as by the magisterium itself that there is but one Church "outside of which there is no salvation." It is difficult to understand how the Vatican schema could be quoted as favoring such an explanation since it states explicitly that "participation of truth and life is not obtained except in the Church and through the Church, which has Christ as its head."[63] More understandable is his citing of J. V. Bainvel whose explanation is somewhat confusing; it *can* be understood as describing the Church as merely the ordinary way of salvation.

---

[59] J. C. Gruden, *The Mystical Christ* (St. Louis 1938) 174.

[60] *Ibid.,* 175.

[61] *Loc. cit.*

[62] *Ibid.,* 177.

In 1939 Delogne published a textbook intended to be used in a course of religious instruction. He states that the use of the body-soul explanation is no longer desirable. Instead "it is preferable to say that those outside the Church in good faith belong not only to the soul of the Church but also to the body (for the two are inseparable); however they belong to the body by an invisible tie: their good faith."[64] In another textbook published in the same year, Texier uses the *re-voto* explanation.[65]

Stoltz's *De Ecclesia,* which appeared in 1939, is very brief, yet considered by many as a significant work. Concerning the *re-voto* explanation, he sees little positive evidence for the acceptability of an implicit desire:

> It can be proven from tradition that an explicit desire can sometimes suffice for salvation. However many difficulties militate against the sufficiency of an implicit desire. We can draw no cogent reason from Revelation to prove that men who possess merely this implicit desire *de facto* attain eternal life; but no one can deny that such is possible through the special intervention of divine grace.[66]

---

[63] ". . . participatio veritatis et vitae non obtinetur, nisi in Ecclesia et per Ecclesiam, cuius caput est Christus." *Mansi* 51. 541 C-D.

[64] "Aujourd'hui, on prefère dire que: ceux qui sont de bonne foi hors de l'Eglise, appartiennent, non seulement à son âme, mais aussi à son corps (car l'une ne va pas sans l'autre), mais ils lui appartiennent par un lien invisible: leur bonne volonté." H. Delogne, *Notre credo veçu* (Paris 1939) 1. 327.

[65] See A. Texier, *Precis d'apologétique* (Paris 1939) 364.

[66] "Votum explicitum ad salutem aliquando sufficere, ex traditione satis probari potest. Contra votum implicitum tamen maxime militant difficultates,

The body-soul explanation is even less traditional and less acceptable:

> The other distinction has a traditional appearance, but actually it is far removed from the traditional doctrine concerning the Body of Christ. First it must be admitted that the soul of the Church is wider in extent than the body; this does not seem fitting. Furthermore this explanation really lacks any traditional foundation, because the text of St. Augustine (Brevil. collat. c. 10) from which it is thought to be drawn, is concerned with the twofold aspect of the one Church (heavenly and earthly), not with any distinction of soul and body in the Church on earth. . . .[67]

In seeking a clear understanding of the axiom, he turns to the Fathers, especially Cyprian and Augustine. His view is that they applied the axiom to the visible Church and their understanding of it is contained in this sentence: "Those who *in any way* stay outside the *visible* Church, cannot be saved."[68] On the basis on this understanding, Stoltz concludes:

> On the basis on what has been said above, namely that neither catechumens, nor material heretics and schismatics are in the Church, the axiom is understood in a strict sense in agreement with the view of the African Fathers. An exception must be admitted for those who place an explicit desire of entering the Church; doubt remains

---

utrum sufficere ad salutem possit; ratio stringens ex Revelatione vix afferri potest huiusmodi homines ad vitam aeternam de facto pervenire; par interventum specialem divinae gratiae tale quid fieri posse nemo negabit." A. Stoltz, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae,* Fasciculus VII de ecclesia (Friburgi Brisgoviae 1939) 35.

[67] "Alia distinctio speciem utique traditionalem prae se fert, de facto autem longe abest a doctrina traditionali corporis Christi. Admittere debet imprimis animam Ecclesiae ultra corpus se extendere, quod videtur minus apte dici; insuper fundamento traditionali caret, quia textus S. Augustini (Brevil. collat. c. 10) ex quo auctores eam sumendam esse censent, de duplui parte (terrestri et caelesti) unius Ecclesiae loquitur, non autem de anima et corpore aliquo Ecclesiae terrestris. . . ." *Ibid.,* 35-36.

[68] ". . . qui versantur *quomodocumque* extra Ecclesiam *visibilem,* salvi fieri non possunt." *Ibid.,* 36.

> concerning the value of an implicit desire. The principle is simply silent concerning these particular cases; but it certainly does not maintain that infidels and heretics who are in good faith will be condemned. On the contrary it is certain that no one will be condemned except for personal guilt. Perhaps an intermediary status can be admitted for those who are without personal guilt, but who are outside the Church.[69]

Stoltz's treatment is brief and quite different from the usual explanation found among the theologians. And this for two reasons. First, although he points correctly to the difficulty of establishing the validity of the implicit desire from the works of the Fathers alone, still his statement that doubt still remains concerning the value of this implicit desire can hardly be accepted. The value of the *votum implicitum* has been unquestioned in Catholic theology since the time of St. Robert Bellarmine.[70] Certainly this view has been constantly and universally advanced since the time of Perrone. Secondly, it is surprising to find Stoltz suggesting as a solution Billot's theory concerning an intermediary state for non-Catholics who are guilty of no personal sin. This theory has found little support among modern theologians and is now generally rejected.[71] These two aspects of Stoltz's treatment weaken his position considerably.

In 1939, William O'Connor authored an article in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* entitled "St. Thomas, the Church and the Mystical Body."[72] He applies three meanings to the term "Mystical

---

[69] "Suppositis supra dicta, quod nempe neque catechumeni neque haeretici et schismatici materialis sint in Ecclesia, axioma in sensu stricto cum Patribus africanis intellectum est. Exceptio admitti debet pro illis, qui votum explicitum ingrediendi Ecclesiam emittunt; de valore voti impliciti remanet dubium. De istis tamen casibus particularibus principium simpliciter silet; certe minime dicit infideles et haereticos in bona fide versantur damnari. E contra certum est neminem autem qui personali culpa carent damnari.

"Pro his autem qui personali culpa carent, sed extra Ecclesiam versantur status intermedius forsitan admitti potest." *Loc. cit.*

[70] See *De ecclesia militante,* Lib 3 Caput 3.

[71] See L. Caperan, *Le probleme du salut des infideles. Essai historique.* (Toulouse 1934) 534-537.

[72] *AER,* 100 (1939) 290-300.

Body." First it can signify the visible Church. Immediately difficulties arise: "There are obvious disadvantages in identifying the Mystical Body exclusively with the visible Church. Who would deny a catechumen who makes an act of perfect love or contrition membership in Christ's Mystical Body?"[73] Secondly the term can signify all those in the state of grace: "All who are in the state of grace accordingly form Christ's Mystical Body even though they may not actually belong to the visible Church."[74] Difficulties arise here also, especially in regard to Catholics in the state of sin. Are they to be called members of the Mystical Body or not?

The author continues that neither of these concepts is St. Thomas' view of the Mystical Body of Christ. For him "all men belong to Christ's Mystical Body."[75] For Christ came to save all without exception: "The mere fact that Christ died to save all, whether they will actually be saved or not, is the reason why He is the head of all men and all men without exception constitute His Mystical Body. The only ones who entirely cease to be the members of Christ are the finally impenitent in the next life."[76] If this view of the Mystical Body is accepted we may well ask ourselves what is the value of belonging to the Catholic Church. O'Connor answers that the Church is necessary for the actuation of the truth which Christ brought into the world. For ideas of themselves remain sterile and soon are lost unless men band themselves together into an organization to promote those ideas; this explains at once the importance and the necessity of the visible Church: " 'Outside the Church there is no salvation' expresses the fundamental truth of human nature that, apart from a visible organization to perpetuate it, no cause and no message, not even the message of salvation, can hope to survive in this world."[77] So there is a sense in which the visible Church can be called the Mystical Body; it is the actuation of the message of Christ. However there are not two distinct Mystical Bodies, the Church and humanity: "The visible Church and all humanity do not form two mutually exclusive Mystical Bodies, for they are but different aspects of one reality. The Mystical Body of mankind includes the visible Church, while the visible Church is the actualization of the redemptive potentialities of mankind."[78]

---

[73] *Ibid.*, 290.

[74] *Loc. cit.*

[75] *Ibid.*, 293.

[76] *Ibid.*, 294.

[77] *Ibid.*, 296.

In the light of this understanding of the nature of the Mystical Body, the axiom of the Church's necessity takes on a new meaning:

> "Outside the Church there is no salvation" now takes on another meaning. God of course is not confined by His sacraments and He can bestow His grace where He will, but just as in the old Dispensation it was necessary to have recourse to the depositaries of the Law to learn the way of salvation and then submit to it, so now it is necessary to have recourse to the visible Church and submit to her as the depository of the means of salvation. Any exception that God himself might wish to make then or now serves only to establish the rule more firmly for us.[79]

The author sums up his view of the importance of the Church in a final paragraph: "How aptly then does St. Paul designate the visible Church as the Body of Christ. Without a body there can be no human life and without the body of Christ, the organized, visible Church, the spiritual life and ideals of Christ would not be a living force in the world today. Only one for whom the life of Christ means nothing can see no particular advantage in belonging to the visible Church."[80]

Basically the Church is necessary that the concepts brought to earth by Christ might perdure; that the way of life he came to establish might not be forgotten by men. This would account for the Church being necessary in order that there might be salvation in the world. This calls to mind de Lubac's "collective" interpretation of the doctrine. In such a view the necessity of personal union with the Church is not apparent.

In 1939, R. Lombardi published the masterly study: *The Salvation of the Unbeliever.* Here Lombardi establishes in great detail the validity of the Catholic contention that God's salvific will is truly universal; that the act of faith is within the ability of every human being. To prove this last point, he appeals to four channels of revelation: the Christian revelation, the Jewish revelation, the primitive revelation and lastly numerous individual channels such as interior illumination, individual and angelic revelations etc.[81] Lombardi insists that this universal possibility of makng an act of divine faith is far from indifferentism; it does no injury to the Catholic claim:

---

[78] *Ibid.,* 298.

[79] *Ibid.,* 299.

[80] *Ibid.,* 300.

> It must be clear that if the defense of this principle has led us in practice to perceive the possibility of salvation even for men who profess religions different from our own during their whole earthly life, we have taken care, in doing this, never to place Catholicism and other religions on the same plane. The means of salvation ordained by God is the Catholic Church and this Church alone, and the normal way of salvation is to belong to her officially, professing her faith entire and receiving the streams of grace that flow through her sacraments. Our final conclusion was only to point out the possible ways —for all other ways may be called extraordinary when compared with the normal way—which God perhaps permits to be used to prepare the act of charity outside the Church, an act which in our own times must necessarily contain the implicit desire to belong to the Church.[82]

---

[81] R. Lombardi, S.J., *La salvezza di chi non ha fede* (4 ed. Rome 1949) 512-513.

[82] "Che se poi la difesa di tale principio ci ha concretamente portati a intravedere per l'appunto la possibilità di salvezza, anche per uomini che rimangono nella professione di religioni diverse dalla nostra durante l'intera esistenza terrena, ciò è stato esposto da noi in modo tale, da non porre mai sullo stesso piano il cattolicismo e le altre religione. Il mezzo di salute voluto da Dio è la Chiesa cattolica, solo la Chiesa cattolica; e via normale per salvarsi è appartenere ad essa ufficialmente, professandone l'intera fede, e godendone i fiumi di grazia attraverso i sacramenti. Nostra ultima conclusione è stata soltanto l'additare le vie possibili—che tutte possono dirsi strarodinarie in confronto della via normale—da cui Dio si contenta forse di veder preparato l'atto di carità fuori della Chiesa, atto che oggi pel non cattolico contiene necessariamente implicito il voto di appartenere alla Chiesa." *Ibid.,* 522-523.

In returning later to a vindication of the Church's claims, Lombardi repeats his appeal to the "normal way of salvation" and uses the distinction between body and soul of the Church: "Even supposing that many of those outside the Church are already in a state of sanctifying grace, based on the minimum indispensable faith, and thus belong to the soul of the Church, nevertheless Jesus desires they should sincerely profess the whole of our faith, desires they should become members of the Church's body, and wants us to lead them to join the Roman, Catholic, Apostolic Church."[83] However the Church is not an invisible society but a social unit which is the normal way of salvation to which Christ wishes to lead all men:

> Only when there is present an implicit desire to belong to this "body" does Jesus apparently dispense from his great commandment those who remain in invincible ignorance of it. But even then he finds some means of uniting them to the "soul" of the Church, through ways which we must consider to be "extraordinary"; and meanwhile he continues to impose the objective command that they should follow the normal way.[84]

Lombardi understands the body-soul distinction in a way which gives greater extension to the soul than the body. This is clear from an earlier passage where he states: "Not all those who remain outside the Church are truly unbelieving; there are faithful, and probably also justified, souls among unbelievers. So many justified souls who are not members of her body yet belong to the soul of the Church."[85]

---

[83] "Supponiamo pure che molti di coloro che non credono come noi, si trovino già in grazia santificante sul fondamento della minima fede indispensabile, e cosi appartengano all'anima della Chiesa. Tuttavia Gesù vuole che professino intera e limpida tutta la nostra fede, vuole che siano aggregati anche al corpo della Chiesa, vuole che noi ne procuriamo l'ingresso ufficiale nella Chiesa cattolica apolstolica romana." *Ibid.*, 655-666.

[84] "Solo in vista di un voto implicito di appartenere a tale 'corpo,' Gesù dispensa apparentemente dal grande comando coloro che invincibilmente lo ignorano. Però anche allora trova modo di unirli all' 'anima' della Chiesa, per vie che vanno considerate 'straordinarie'; e intanto mantiene oggettivamente il comando, che essi raggiungano la via vormale." *Ibid.*, 656.

Lombardi does not consider explicitly the doctrine of the Church's necessity. His reference to the Church's role is only an oblique one. It would be a mistake to predicate of him the opinion that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation; rather it is *open, official* belonging which is the ordinary, normal way of salvation. Where there exists an implicit desire to belong to the Church, Christ dispenses from the necessity of the Church, but in so doing attaches the person to the soul of the Church. This explanation deprives the *votum* of all active causal influence in procuring salvation; rather it is a condition which moves God to dispense from the precept to enter the Church. Furthermore the body-soul distinction employed here has long been strenuously objected to by theologians.

Worthy of mention next is a statement uttered by Pius XII in a discourse to the seminarists of Rome on June 24, 1939. He said: "It is wrong to distinguish the juridic Church from the Church of charity. It is not so; but the Church juridically founded which has the Supreme Pontiff as head, is also the Church of charity, and the universal family of Christians."[86] Thus at this time the Pontiff felt it necessary to speak out plainly and condemn a view of the Church which has been explicitly presented in some of the works reviewed thus far; and which has been strongly implied in others.

Vellico, in his *De ecclesia,* published in 1940, states the doctrine in this proposition: "The Church is a necessary society; it is necessary for the attainment of salvation with the necessity of means: whence we have the axiom: Outside the Church, no salvation."[87] In explaining the possibility of salvation for non-Catholics, he shows little liking for Hugon's solution. He quotes Bainvel and Caperan to the effect that it can suffice to pertain to the body of the Church in desire. This explanation pleases him because it both protects the necessity of the Church and offers an explanation of the salvation of non-Catholics.

---

[85] "Non tutti coloro che non credono con la Chiesa sono propriamente increduli; ci sono dei fedeli e probabilmente dei guisti anche fra gl'infedeli. All' anima della Chiesa appartengono tanti giusti, che non sono membra del suo corpo." *Ibid.,* 574-575.

[86] "Perperam scernitur ecclesia juridica ab ecclesia caritatis. Non ita, sed illa Ecclesia jure fundata, cuius caput Pontifex est, eadem est Ecclesia Christi, Ecclesia caritatis, universaque christianorum familia." Pius XII, "Sermo ad alumnos seminariorum. . . ." *AAS* 31 (1939) 250.

Aspects of the Church by Yves de Montcheuil gathers together a series of lectures given by the author to the students at the Catholic Institute of Paris during the year 1942-1943. It was the author's intention to give them a final revision before they were published, but he never succeeded in doing so as he was killed by the Gestapo in 1944. His lectures were published in 1949 and translated into English in 1955.

The lecture which concerns the present inquiry comprises chapter ten: "The salvation of non-believers." Part of the explanation of the axiom of the necessity of the Church for salvation is found in the realization that the Church in heaven is not a different Church from the one on earth; it is merely the Church in its final form. And into this Church all the saved will ultimately be incorporated: "There is then no obtaining of salvation except 'in the form of a Church,' in a spiritual community. And there will be no other community than that which will exist under Christ, and which is to be the definitive form of the one only Catholic Church. Thus no salvation is possible without final integration into the Catholic Church. . . ."[88]

Another portion of the explanation takes notice of the fact that the Church is responsible for all the grace in the world. Christ redeemed mankind, but: ". . . how is this Redemption accomplished? How is the source of grace, tainted by sin, replaced in mankind? By the sacrifice of Christ of course. But the fruit of this sacrifice, the presence of grace, is linked in the plan of God to the existence of a Church, of a visible society which is the Catholic Church."[89] Just as the material universe was made for man, so grace owes its existence to the Church: ". . . there would never have been any grace at work in the bosom of the human race, if there were not one day to be, if there were not today the Church. The Church, as its end and condition, is therefore the explanation for the existence of grace. She it is in whom grace has taken root in mankind. The presence of grace in the world is bound up, by the Will of God, with the presence of the Church."[90] However this is not to be interpreted as meaning that there is no grace outside the Church: "Grace can act, it does act, outside the visible limits of the Church, but its presence and activity are nonetheless connected to the visible Church, from the moment that God linked up the salvation of the world with the constitution of a Church."[91] These two elements then comprise a partial explanation of the doctrine: the Church is necessary because all the saved will ultimately be joined to the Church in Heaven which is the definitive form of the Catholic Church; also the Church is necessary as the source of grace, as the reason explaining the granting of grace to mankind. These two elements, however, do not comprise the whole meaning of the doctrine.

---

[87] "Ecclesia societas est necessaria et quidem necessitas medii ad aeternam salutem obtinendam, unde valet axioma: Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus." P. Vellico, O.F.M., *De ecclesia christi* (Rome 1940) 457.

[88] "Il n'y a donc d'obtention possible du salut 'qu'en forme d'Eglise,' dans une communaute spirituelle. Et il n'y aura point d'autre communauté que celle qui existera sous le Christ, et qui doit être la forme définitive de l'unique Eglise catholique. Donc, pas de salut possible sans intégration finale à l'Eglise catholique." Yves de Montcheuil, S.J., *Aspects de l'église* (Paris 1951) 132-133.

Montcheuil's essential explanation is built upon his consideration of the nature of the Church. The Church on earth is not a static institution. It is constantly growing. So that all the good done anywhere in the world is ultimately work that is done for the Church, even though it be done from afar: "The Church . . . is not something all completed, static; she is a growing reality whose goal is to spread out even to the very dimensions of mankind. This must be understood to mean not only in extent, geographically so to speak, but also qualitatively. She has to assimilate, in order to convert and transfigure it, whatever good is done in human order."[92] So it follows necessarily that those who promote whatever is basically good are really working for and with the Church, even though the very existence of the Church may remain unknown to them:

---

[89] "Mais comment se fait cette Rédemption? Comment la source de grâce, tarie par le péché, est-elle inserée de nouveau dans l'humanité? Par le sacrifice du Christ assurément. Mais le fruit de ce sacrifice, la présence de la grâce, est lié dans le plan de Dieu à l'existence d'une Église, d'une société visible qui est l'Eglise catholique." *Ibid.,* 134.

[90] ". . . il n'y aurait jamais eu de grâce en travail au sein du genre humain, s'il n'avait pas du y avoir un jour, s'il n'y avait pas aujourd'hui l'Eglise. L'Eglise est donc ce qui explique l'existence de la grâce, comme sa fin et sa condition. Elle est ce en quoi la grâce a pris racine dans l'humanité. La présence de la grâce dans le monde est liée par la volonté de Dieu à la presence de l'Eglise." *Loc. cit.*

[91] "La grâce peut agir, elle agit bien au-delà des limites visibles de l'Eglise, mais sa présence et son activité n'en sont pas moins liées à l'Eglise visible, du moment que Dieu a lié le salut du monde a la constitution d'une Eglise." *Loc. cit.*

> . . . all those who, under the influence of grace, work toward the accomplishment of something good, something of value, something that represents a human value in the real sense of the word, in whatever situation they find themselves, are in reality working for the Church, even without knowing it. They are working for something that will in the end be taken back and consecrated by the Church, and that will have some kind of efficacity in bringing her to her goal.[93]

Such people, though they do not belong to the Church, nevertheless are not without some relationship to her. They are working for the same goal and by reason of this labor are entitled to a reward:

---

[92] "L'Eglise, nous avons dejà eu plusieurs fois l'occasion de le dire, n'est pas quelque chose de tout fait, de statique: elle est une réalité en croissance, dont le but est de s'éntendre aux dimensions memes de l'humanité. In faut comprendre celà non pas seulement en extension, géographiquement pour ainsi dire, mais aussi qualitativement. Elle doit assimiler, pour le convertir et le transfigurer, tout ce qui se fait de bien dans l'order humain." *Ibid.,* 135.

[93] "Aussi, tous ceux qui, dans quelque situation qu'ils se trouvent, travaillent sous l'action de la grâce à faire quelque chose de bon, quelque chose de valable, quelque chose qui represents une valeur humaine au vrai sens du mot, ceux-là travaillent en realité pour l'Eglise, même sans le savoir. Ils travaillent pour quelque chose qui sera finalement repris et consacré par l'Eglise, et qui aura une part d'efficacité pour la mener à son terme." *Ibid.,* 135-136.

"We can understand then that they are able to benefit from the salvation brought into the world by Christ and carried out by the Church, and do so by reason of what they do for her without knowing it."[94] If these people are not members of the Church through no guilt on their part, then their "working for the Church" places them within the Church in a salvific sense, whether they are aware of it or not:

> Therefore, not only is no one ever saved except by a grace which is bound up with the existence of the Church, but too, no one is ever saved except with relation to this unique Church because without knowing it, one lives by her and lives for her as best he can. Of all those who have these salutary dispositions, it can be said that they are already in the Church "by desire." In fact, if they have this implicit will to follow the light of grace and to respond to all its demands, in the event that they were to realize the necessity of entering the Church, they would respond to it immediately. They would not then have to make a new decision to place an act changing the movement which already animated them.[95]

This, in essence is the explanation of Montcheuil. Non-Catholics are saved by a grace which is linked to the Church; and also because they are actually trying to effect the same result as the Church is, and hence are working for the Church without actually being in it. They are, consequently, in the Church "by desire."

---

[94] "On comprend donc qu'ils puissent bénéficier du salut apporté au monde par le Christ et réalisé par l'Eglise; cela, en raison même de ce qu'ils font pour elle sans le savoir." *Ibid.,* 136.

[95] "Donc, non seulement on n'est jamais sauvé que par une grâce qui est liée à l'existence de l'Eglise, mais aussi on n'est jamais sauvé que par rapport a cette unique Eglise, parce que sans le savoir on vit d'elle et qu'on vit de son mieux pour elle.

"De tous ceux qui sont dans ces dispositions salutaires, on peut dire qu'ils sont dejà dans l'Eglise 'par le désir.' En effet, s'ils ont cette volonté implicite de suivre la lumière de la grâce et de répondre à ses exigencies, au cas où la necessité d'entrer dans l'Eglise se trouverait circonnue par eux, ils y répondraient aussitôt. Ils n'aurient pas alors à prendre une décision nouvelle pour poser un acte changeant leur orientation: ils n'auraient qu'a poursuivre le mouvement qui dejà les anime." *Ibid.,* 137.

The fact that such people can be saved does not diminish the importance of membership in the Church; for such people can be saved only as long as they are guiltless and in invincible ignorance of the obligation of entering the Church.

In this un-revised edition of de Montcheuil's lectures, there are certain elements which are irrevelant; others which need further clarification before they may be accepted as explanations of the doctrine of the Church's necessity. The first two items advanced as portions of the explanation seem irrelevant. He states "thus no salvation is possible without final integration into the Catholic Church," meaning the Church in heaven. The constant practice of theologians has been to apply this doctrine solely to the Church Militant of the New Testament. So when de Montcheuil applies the term Church to the Church in heaven and shows that the axiom is valid even in that regard, he may present an interesting observation, but it adds no light in regard to the true meaning of the axiom and may be the cause of confusion.

Secondly, the assertion that the presence of grace in the world is bound up, in God's plan, with the presence of the Church on earth may account for salvation coming *per ecclesiam,* but not *in ecclesia.* The influence of de Lubac's theory is discernible here. What has been remarked concerning that view is applicable here. It is not enough to advance the general statement that all grace in the world is due to the Church, unless one also indicates that it is the sole possession of the Church, not in such wise that "there is no grace outside the Church," but in such a manner that all who attain to grace and finally to justification must do so through union with the Church "outside of which there is neither salvation, nor the remission of sins."[96]

However these are not the major components of de Montcheuil's explanation. The focal point is the contention that good people who work for the same end as the Church are thereby entitled to receive the reward the Church is instituted to dispense: salvation. He declares that "in the final analysis what effects salvation is that they have worked for her without knowing it, to the best of their ability. . . ." Thus the Church labors to transform and consecrate all that is good and is helped in this by men of good will who are independently working for the same goal.

---

[96] Bull *Unam Sanctam,* D. 468.

There is an apparent similarity between this and the words of Pius IX that those "in invincible ignorance of our most holy religion, and who, assiduously observing the natural law and its precept . . . and being ready to obey God, live an honest and upright life, can, through the working of the divine light and grace, attain eternal life. . . ."[97] However the similarity is not marked; for Pius IX makes no indication that these people, by their actions, are helping the Church to attain its goal. The only result of their activity is the attainment of their personal salvation; and in the light of his other statements, the clear implication is that such people are already within the Church in a salvific sense; that is the reason why salvation is possible for them.

De Montcheuil, on the other hand, pictures the Church as something constantly in search of some raw-material of goodness which it can consecrate and offer to God. Since anyone who prepares this material is aiding the Church, he is entitled to a reward. This concept of "working for the Church" and thus qualifying for salvation is a new and startling explanation of the *votum ecclesiae.* It will help to clarify this point to recall the words of the Council of Florence concerning the value of ecclesiastical unity: ". . . so much is the unity of the ecclesiastical body worth, that only for those remaining in it are the ecclesiastical sacraments profitable for salvation, and do fasting, alms and the other pious practices and exercises of the Christian warfare bring forth eternal rewards."[98] Thus all the good activity which de Montcheuil describes would be positively useless unless the people involved were already partakers, in some way, of this unity of the ecclesiastical body. Their activity cannot put them into the Church, nor reap any benefit for them; rather they must be within the Church to benefit by their actions. There is a vital issue of causality involved here. For the Church, in a sense, is something static, something formed; it is not something which the good activity of all men is constantly bringing into being. The Church is the household of God charged with an urgent missionary duty of bringing salvation to men. It is not something which men of good will can build and perfect by their own actions. Good works performed outside the Church do facilitate her mission. However de Montcheuil attributes much more than this to these good works.

---

[97] Pius IX, *Quanto conficiamur moerere,* see above, 24 f.

[98] ". . . tantumque valere ecclesiastici corporis unitatem, ut solum in ea manentibus ad salutem ecclesiastica sacramenta proficiant, et ieiunia, eleemosynae ac cetera pietatis officia et exercitia militiae christianae praemia aeterna parturiant." *Decretum pro Jacobitis,* D. 174.

De Montcheuil endeavors to establish the fact that all this activity on the part of good men amounts to an implicit desire to belong to the Church. It is a concept of the *votum* remarkably different from the common view of theologians. It seems to be seriously defective in as much as it describes union with the Church as a union of parallel causes rather than a subordination of the individual to the cause of salvation. Had emphasis not been placed upon the work which good people are doing for the Church, all danger of infringement upon the exclusive missionary assignment of the Church would have been removed. The Church would not be represented as something still to be formed; something still evolving; but as something with an urgent mission to save mankind; to bring the message and the realization of salvation to all. This attempt to understand "in depth," the concept of *votum ecclesiae* was hampered by the author's dependence upon the view of de Lubac. Finally it should be remembered that the author himself intended to revise these lectures before publishing them. If he had had the benefit of the theological development of the last few years, he would no doubt have altered them greatly. It is regrettable that they were published without the necessary adjustments.

In 1942 William Boat authored an article in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* entitled *Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus.* He begins by establishing the distinction between the body and soul of the Church and then makes four statements: "(1) he who belongs to the body and the soul of the Church may be saved: (2) he who belongs to the soul, and not the body, may be saved: (3) he who belongs to the body and not to the soul, may not be saved: (4) he who belongs neither to the body nor soul, may not be saved."[99] The most interesting statement is the second and in explanation of it, he writes: "Those who belong to the soul of the Church, and not the body, strictly speaking, may be said to be those who would belong to the body if they knew there were a body, where it might be, or how to be incorporated. Though these do not belong to the visible body, they might be said to be in it by implication."[100] Thus Boat sees the *votum* as attaching a person primarily to the soul of the Church; such a person is also in the body "by implication." Such an explanation removes many of the objectionable features of the simply body-soul explanation; however the explanation is still somewhat handicapped since it rests completely upon the distinction between body and soul of the Church; the body being the visible Church and the soul, the complexity of sanctifying grace and the theological virtues.

4. SUMMARY

During this period the conviction continued to be unanimous that men could be saved through a union with the Church which was less than membership. The rejection of the body-soul explanation was frequent, but not yet universal; all authors accepted the necessity of some union with the visible Church. It was the nature of that attachment that was closely examined; and in examining it, several authors seemed to weaken, or even totally destroy the concept of the visible Church as a necessary personal cause of the salvation of every man.

The three most penetrating studies were made by Congar, de Lubac and de Montcheuil, no one of whom can be said to have clearly assigned a necessary causal role to the Catholic Church. Congar emphasized greatly the internal aspect of the Church viewed as a sharing in the life of God; with greater care than some of his predecessors he attempted to identify the internal and external aspects of the Church as merely two aspects of the one reality. He repudiated explicitly any concept of a visible and an invisible Church. Yet he later accepted it as obvious that "Christendom or the mystical Body is not coterminous with the visible reality of the Church." An attempt to reconcile this with his earlier statement leads to the conclusion that "visible ecclesiastical structure" and "Church" signify two different realities for him; he seems to have returned to the position he rejected at the outset. This confusion is augmented by his use of the term "Church" in two senses, which are not always clearly distinguished. This obscurity added to his view of the efficacy of the separated "fibres" of the Mystical Body leaves little basis for establishing the necessary causal role of the Catholic Church.

---

[99] *AER,* 107 (1942) 291.
[100] *Ibid.,* 293.

De Lubac accounts for salvation *per ecclesiam* only, by interpreting the doctrine collectively; the Church is necessary for mankind as a whole. The attachment of non-Catholics to the Church rests upon the fact that they are a part of humanity which is to be saved; this is their vital attachment to the Church. He likewise finds elements of the true religion in all sects and sees them as anticipations of the Church. He insists that they must be completed by "Christianity," but this is not apparently synonymous with Roman Catholic Church.

Akin to de Lubac is O'Connor who sees the whole human race as comprising the Mystical Body, simply because all men have been redeemed by Christ. The visible Church is necessary only to actualize the ideas of Christ; again the necessity is not clearly a personal one for each individual. De Montcheuil emphasizes the good that exists in the world and sees this as aiding the Church, even preparing for it and winning salvation for those who are not yet members of the Church.

Two manualists, Vellico and Stoltz, use the *re-voto* explanation; Stoltz voices a doubt concerning the acceptability of an implicit desire. Delogne sees the union with the Church as formed merely by good faith; and Gruden actually destroys the necessity of the Church by his explanation.

In the last two periods examined, the nature of the attachment to the Church which is something less than actual membership has been closely examined. That attachment has been variously defined as subordination to Christ, participation in Christ's supernatural life, or simply conformity in human nature. Previously theologians had regarded this attachment as a personal one;

effected by the dispositions of the individual. This remained true whether the desire was an implicit or an explicit one. In these later times, that attachment has been described so as to lose much of its personal aspect and become more ontological. This attachment to the Church in desire resulted from a status, sometimes simple participation in human nature, and not from personal dispositions.

Many of these recent views have included explicitly or implicitly a concept of two Churches, visible and invisible. Even those authors who deny the existence of two Churches sometimes gave such pre-eminence to the internal aspect of the Church that the importance of the visible structure is obscured. In the midst of this growing tendency, it is of high significance to note the statement of Pius XII to the seminarists of Rome recorded above. The Pontiff was explicit in denying the concept of two Churches. His statement is designed to highlight the importance of the visible ecclesiastical structure of the Roman Catholic Church.

PART III

THE PONTIFICATE OF POPE PIUS XII

CHAPTER IX

THE ENCYCLICAL MYSTICI CORPORIS CHRISTI AND ITS EFFECTS

1. THE ENCYCLICAL MYSTICI CORPORIS CHRISTI

On the twenty-ninth of June, 1943, Pope Pius XII issued the encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi,* by far the most important twentieth-century magisterial document is ecclesiology. In this encyclical the Pontiff does not treat *ex professo* the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation; but there are several statements which, because of their authority and clarity, have brought precision to four aspects of this doctrine.

A. *The Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are the same reality*

To express this truth, the Pontiff declares that no better definition of the Church could be given than that of the Mystical Body of Christ:

> If we would define and describe the true Church of Jesus Christ—which is the One, Holy, Catholic Apostolic Roman Church—we shall find nothing more noble, more sublime, or more divine than the expression "the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ,"—an expression which springs from and is, as it were, the fair flowering of the repeated teaching of the Sacred Scriptures and the holy Fathers.[1]

B. *The importance of the visible ecclesiastical structure*

In speaking of the Church as a body, the Pontiff states: "Hence they err in a matter of divine truth, who imagine the Church to be invisible, intangible, a something merely 'pneumatological' as they say, by which many Christian communities, though they differ from each other in their profession of faith, are united by an invisible bond."[2] He returns to this question of the importance of the visible aspect of the Church later saying: "it is clear, We think, how grievously they err who arbitrarily claim that the Church is something hidden and invisible, as they also do who look upon her as a mere human institution possessing a certain disciplinary code and external ritual, but lacking power to communicate supernatural life."[3] And again: ". . . We deplore and condemn the pernicious error of those who dream of an imaginary Church, a kind of society that finds its origin and growth in charity, to which, somewhat contemptuously, they oppose another, which they call juridical. But this distinction which they introduce is false."[4] The underlying reason for this is the unity which exists between the visible and invisible aspects of the Church. Just as Christ is not complete if only His human nature, or His divine nature is considered, so too the Church is not complete if only its internal, or its external aspect is considered apart from the other. These statements of the Holy Father serve to emphasize the importance of the visible aspect of the Church; to tie the invisible firmly to this visible aspect. The two are not to be separated. For God willed to "lead man back to things invisible under a visible rule."[5] This view expressed by the encyclical represents a firm rejection of the recent tendency to emphasize the internal aspect of the Church, while at the same time minimizing, implicitly or explicitly, the importance and necessity of the external.

---

[1] Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis, AAS,* 35, 199; Eng. tr.: *Mystici Corporis. Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XII on the Mystical Body of Christ* (Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C., 1943) 8.

C. *The concept of the Church as a necessary cause of the salvation of each man*

In speaking of the great graces earned by Christ on the Cross, he states: "It is possible for Him of Himself to impart these graces to mankind directly; but He willed to do so only through a visible Church made up of men; so that through her all might cooperate with Him in dispensing the graces of Redemption."[6] Returning to this theme later in the encyclical, the Holy Father states: "Dying on the Cross He left His Church the immense treasury of the Redemption, towards which she contributed nothing. But when those graces come to be distributed, not only does He share this work of sanctification with His Church, but He wills that in some way *it be due to her action.*"[7] These statements seem to form a firm basis for the concept seen in many of the authors to date: that of the Church as a necessary cause, which simply must be utilized in some way. She exercises a causal influence which cannot be substituted for; it simply must be present.

---

[2] *Ibid.*, 200; Eng. tr. 8.

[3] *Ibid.*, 223; Eng. tr. 25.

[4] *Ibid.*, 224; Eng. tr. 25.

[5] *Loc. cit.*

D. *The distinction between membership and belonging to the Church in desire*

In two separate passages, the Holy Father describes two distinct classes of people: those who are members of the Church and those who "have a certain relationship" to the Church. In the first text, the meaning of the term "member" seems to have been brought to final precision. Speaking of those who comprise the membership of the Church, the Holy Father writes: "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed."[8] Commenting on this passage, Tromp observes: "Take notice of the word *reapse* placed in the beginning of the paragraph; this passage is concerned with those who pertain to the Church *really* [*re*]; see section 101 for those who are related to the Church in desire [*voto*]."[9]

The section of the encyclical to which Tromp refers occurs near the end and is concerned with those who are not yet members of the Church. It reads:

---

[6] *Ibid.,* 199; Eng. tr. 25.

[7] *Ibid.,* 213; Eng. tr. 18 (italics added).

[8] *Ibid.,* 212; Eng. tr. 10.

[9] "Nota in initio paragraphi vocem *reapse*: agitur enim hoc loco de iis, qui *re* pertinent ad Ecclesiam; de iis autem, qui *voto* ad Ecclesiam ordinantur, vide infra # 101." S. Tromp, S.J., *"Annotationes," Periodica,* 32 (1943) 386.

> As you know, Venerable Brethren, from the very beginning of Our Pontificate, We have committed to the protection and guidance of heaven those who do not belong to the visible Body of the Catholic Church, solemnly declaring that after the example of the Good Shepherd We desire nothing more ardently than that they may have life and have it more abundantly. Imploring the prayers of the whole Church We wish to repeat this solemn declaration in this Encyclical Letter in which We have proclaimed the praises of the "great and glorious Body of Christ," and from a heart overflowing with love We ask each and every one of them to correspond to the interior movements of grace, and to seek to withdraw from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. For even though by an unconscious desire and longing they have a certain relationship with the Mystical Body of the Redeemer, they still remain deprived of those many heavenly gifts and helps which can only be enjoyed in the Catholic Church.[10]

In the passage the Holy Father would seem to be referring to those persons who possess a *votum ecclesiae,* which may be implicit or explicit. It is clear that this whole section of the encyclical is concerned with non-Catholics. The Holy Father singles out of these a class of individuals who, in the language of earlier theologians, pertain to the Church *in voto.* For three things can be predicated of these people: 1. They are not members of the Church. 2. ". . . by an unconscious desire and longing they have a certain relationship with the Mystical Body. . . ." 3. Salvation is possible for them. Although they are in a distinctly inferior position, still there is no question concerning the possibility of salvation for them; rather the question is one of assurance concerning their salvation. Their attachment to the Church is salvific in the sense that it fulfills the exigencies imposed by the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. So it would seem accurate to equate this passage with the theologians' description of those who possess the *votum ecclesiae.* In his commentary on this text, Tromp takes this precise view. He writes:

---

[10] Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis, AAS,* 35, 242-243; Eng. tr. 39.

> This passage is concerned with those who pertain to the Church only in desire, in opposition to paragraph 21-22 which treats of those who are really members of the Church. Those who are joined to the Church only in desire, are indeed related to the Body of Christ, and therefore are not necessarily withdrawn from the influence of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless they are still deprived of the many divine aids which are found only in the true Church.[11]

He still held the same view of the text in 1948 when he commented thus upon the passage concerning members: "Really: that is *re,* in opposition to *voto.* Concerning those who pertain to the Church in desire (*voto*), see paragraph 101."[12]

Thus the text of the encyclical seems to describe only a *certain class* of non-Catholics who are in some way related to the Mystical Body; for them salvation, if difficult, is at least possible. The Holy Father confirms, by the weight of his authority, the distinction, widely used by theologians, between belonging to the Church *in re* and *in voto.* The term "member" is used only with reference to the former.

2. POST-ENCYCLICAL WRITINGS

In 1944, Dumont in an essay entitled *"L'église et les églises"* considers the position of believers in Jesus Christ who are not members of the Catholic Church. Although they are not official members, they are members in a sense:

---

[11] "Hic agitur de iis qui voto tantum ad Ecclesiam pertinent in oppositione ad # 21-22, ubi de iis qui reapse membra sunt Ecclesiae. Qui voto tantum cum Ecclesia coniunguntur, ordinantur quidem ad Corpus Christi, ideoque non necessario influxui Spiritus Sancti subtrahuntur: carent tamen tot ac tantis divinis auxiliis, quae solummodo dantur in vera Ecclesia." S. Tromp, *op. cit.,* 400.

[12] "Reapse: id est *re,* in oppositione ad *voto.* De iis qui voto tantum pertinent ad Ecclesiam, vide # 101." S. Tromp, *Textus Et Documenta. Litterae Encyclicae II—Pius Papa XII de Mystico Christi Corpore* (2. ed. Romae 1948) 84.

> But if a separated Christian has only faith as a means of uniting himself with the Divinity . . . the perfection of faith can include the desire of baptism and of all that God has prescribed as indispensable for salvation. Participation in Christ by faith is then considerably strengthened by baptism of desire. If this does not impress the character on the soul, nevertheless it does confer grace and the infused virtues. It makes the believer a being grafted on to Christ, because of his faith and charity and consequently a member of His Church.[13]

For the Church is not merely a visible society. It must include all those who share the life of Christ, thus: "There is born from this union of the faithful with the Saviour, under the first ecclesiastical society, another group, purely invisible and mystic, which gathers together in unity all the believers in Christ, and which is also the Church."[14] So the Church is adequately defined as "Christ poured out and communicated amongst men." The Church then can be viewed in a double way; as a visible society, composed of official members; or as an invisible society composed of all who share the life of Christ. The two are not co-extensive: "Their limits do not correspond. . . . The invisible society surpasses the visible society." For if men are united to Christ, they must be united to the Church: "Their attachment to Christ allows the Church to consider them as her own; it places faith and charity as the foundation of their desire; they will be members of the Church, by desire, invisibly, mystically. The reality of their belonging to Christ will obtain their belonging to the Church. Nevertheless it will not equal the attachment of the Catholic faithful who are totally conformed to the will of the Lord." Dumont sums up his view in the light of these considerations:

---

[13] "Que si le crétien séparé n'avait, pourmoyen de s'agréger au divin que la seule foi . . . la perfection de celle-ci peut inclure le désir du baptême et de tout ce que le Seigneur a prescrit comme indispensable au salut. La participation au Christ par la foi est alors doublée par le baptême de désir. Celui-ci, s'il n'imprime pas dans l'âme le caractère sacramentel, lui confère pourtant la grâce et les vertus infusés: il fait du croyant un être enté sur le Christ, à cause de sa foi et de sa charité, et conséquemment un membre de son Eglise." P. Dumont, *"L'église et les églises,"* in *Qu'est-ce que l'Orthodoxie —vue catholique* (Bruxelles 1944) 26-27.

[14] "De cette union des fidèles au Sauveur nait, sous la première société ecclésiastique, un autre groupement, purement invisible et mystique celui-là, qui rassemble dans l'unité tous les croyants au Christ et quí est aussi l'Eglise." *Ibid.,* 19.

> . . . this is how the Church appears to us. It is the totality of the believers in Jesus Christ. Those who realize fully the conditions fixed by Our Lord enjoy the plenitude of rights assigned by Him to the faithful. . . . Those among the believers who put in practice only a part of the conditions for salvation—but who are already made participants in the life of Christ through faith—have an objective part in the rights of adoption in the measure that they are objectively conformed to the divine will. A desire can substitute for and thus remedy in them the deficiency of supernatural gifts on the condition that their good faith remains complete.[15]

One difficulty here is the positing of two un-equal societies, one visible and the other invisible. This would seem to conflict with the doctrine put forth in the encyclical regarding the extension of the Church and the Mystical Body. There is also a use of the term member which departs somewhat from the Pope's use. Basically, Dumont views dissidents as united to the Church *because* they are part of an invisible society of those united to Christ. Union with the Church is thus a result of salvation, not clearly a cause. With further elaboration, the author would perhaps remove these difficulties; as the article stands, it does not weigh the precisions of the encyclical.

---

[15] "Le Christ répandu et communiqué parmi les hommes." *Ibid., 37.*

"Leur limites ne correspondent pas. . . . La société invisible débordera la société visible." *Ibid., 37-38.*

"Leur attachement au Christ leur permettra d'être considérés par l'Eglise comme quelques-uns des siens; il mettra à la base de leur désir leur foi et leur charité; ils seront membres de l'Eglise, par désir, invisiblement, mystiquement. La réalité de leur appartenance au Christ gagnera leur appartenance à l'Eglise. Pourtant elle n'égalera pas l'appartenance des fidèles catholiques qui ont pour eux la totale conformité à la volonté du Seigneur." *Ibid., 38-39.*

". . . telle peut donc nous apparaître l'Eglise. Somme des croyants en Jésus-Christ. Ceux qui réalisent intégralement les conditions fixées par le Seigneur jouissent de la plénitude des droits assignés par lui à ses fidèles. . . . Ceux parmi les croyants qui ne mettent an pratique qu'une partie des conditions de salut—mais que leur foi dans le Christ a rendus dèjà participants de sa vie—dans la mesure òu objectivement ils se sont conformés aux divines volontés ont une part objective aux droits de l'adoption. Une suppléance de désir peut remédier à la déficience en eux des dons surnaturels à condition que leur bonne foi demeure entière." *Ibid., 39.*

In the fourth edition of Lercher's *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* which was published in 1945, the explanation of the Church's necessity is the same as that of the 1927 edition. However there is one change in terminology which is significant. The earlier edition had observed that the use of the external means and a desire of this same means are not two distinct means but are related to one another as "an object to its substitute." In the 1945 edition this is amended to read that these are not two distinct means but "are related one to another as an initial use and a full use of the same means."[16] The change is small but significant in as much as it bears witness to a desire to remove any doubt concerning the absolute necessity of the Church as a means of salvation. Where the earlier text spoke of a substitute, the second clearly states that it is merely a matter of two diverse ways of employing the one necessary means. This is a refinement which illustrates the growing care of the school theologians regarding the terminology used in describing the role of the Church. The Church is an absolutely necessary cause and the terminology is polished to accentuate this fact.

In 1946 James Carrigan published a brochure entitled "Body and Soul of the Church." This represented the last two chapters of a dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology to the Faculty of Theology of the University of Montreal. This study is concerned with the distinction between the body and soul of the Church and its application to the axiom "outside the Church no salvation."

---

[16] "Ipsum externum medium re adhibitum, eiusdemque medii votum non sunt duo media distincta, sed potius se habent sicut eiusdem medii usus inchoatus et usus plenus. . . ." L. Lercher & F. Schlagenhaufen, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* 2 (5 ed. Oeniponte 1951) 247.

The author first rejects as not traditional and as leading to erroneous doctrine the explanation utilizing the distinction between body and soul of the Church. He rejects also as inadequate the explanation which states that one must belong to the soul of the Church with necessity of means and to the body only with the necessity of precept. In advancing his own explanation of the axiom, he first establishes the necessity of membership in the Mystical Body in order to be saved. He quotes from the schema submitted to the Vatican Council,[17] as well as from St. Thomas,[18] and the Scriptures[19] to prove that no one can be saved unless he is a member of the Mystical Body. On this ground he rejects the explanation which involves the distinction between belonging to the Church *in re* and *in voto.*

> From this it may appear that the solution which uses the distinction between *in re* and *in voto* is insufficient. Certainly it is not in keeping with what we have said to maintain merely that it is necessary to belong to the Church either actually or by desire. Since membership in the Mystical Body of Christ is an absolute necessity, it cannot be supplied by desire alone. But, still, this does not mean that the distinction *in re* or *in voto* has no place in this question. As we shall see, it enters into the problem, but it must be accompanied with certain explanations.[20]

He then gives his own explanation which involves the distinction between ordinary and extraordinary membership in the Church. He presents it in summary form:

---

[17] See J. Carrigan, *Body and Soul of the Church* (London, Ontario, 1946) 28. Carrigan translates the passage thus: "To obtain salvation . . . the Church of Christ is as necessary as membership and union with Christ, the Head and with His Mystical Body." The words translated as "membership and union are "consortium et conjunctio." (For the full text, see Mansi 51.541.)

[18] See *loc. cit.* He quotes St. Thomas' reference to the "unity of the Mystical Body, without which there can be no salvation." The text is taken from III q. 73 a. 3 c.

[19] See *loc. cit.* The quotation is from Acts 4:12: *For there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved.* He also refers to Jn. 15:6 where Christ is called the vine in which men must abide in order to bear fruit.

[20] *Ibid.,* 29.

> The explanation, therefore, of the axiom, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus,* may be resumed very briefly in this way. The Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ and it is absolutely necessary to be a member of this body in order to be saved. The ordinary members of the Church are those who have been baptized and have preserved the external bonds of the profession of faith and submission to lawful authority. . . . But still, as we have seen, it is possible for one whom we designate as a non-Catholic—let us say, for example, that he is completely ignorant of the true Church—to be sanctified and obtain an eternal reward. How can he be saved if there is no salvation outside the Church? The solution is that he is really a member of the Church, but an extraordinary one. The fact of being sanctified implies an actual union with the Mystical Body of Christ. There must be, however, some relation to the ordinary means of membership, because Christ instituted them as a means of grace. But for this person, the implicit desire of fulfilling these ordinary conditions which is contained in his act of charity at the moment of sanctification, is sufficient. Individuals in this position, therefore, are really members of the Church. . . . We might say in short, that it [the axiom] means this: those who are neither ordinary nor extraordinary members of the Church of Christ, cannot be saved.[21]

Carrigan concludes his treatment by answering two objections which may be raised. First his view is not opposed to the visibility of the Church. While there are invisible and extraordinary members, the Church still remains discernible and an organized, conspicuous, society. Nor is there any conflict here with the statement of Pius XII regarding membership in the Church. The Holy Father is speaking only of an official enumeration of members "as when, for example, the names of members of a society are entered in a register. Only those mentioned are to be officially recognized as members of the Church. In our opinion, therefore, the Pope is dealing only with the ordinary means of membership, and, therefore, his words are not opposed to the opinion we have put forth."[22]

---

[21] *Ibid.,* 28-29.

In trying to establish the necessity of membership in the Mystical Body as a necessary condition for salvation, Carrigan seems to have drawn more from the texts quoted than they contain. The passage quoted from the schema submitted to the Vatican Council speaks of a necessity of a *"consortium et conjunctio cum Christo capite."*[23] Now neither of these words need *necessarily* be translated as membership; they may signify a "partaking and union" which is something short of membership. Likewise the quotations from St. Thomas and Scripture signify union with Christ not necessarily membership. In no one of these texts is the term member used. Membership is a specialized concept; since the time of Gregory of Valentia and Francis Sylvius it has indicated, for many theologians, only those who profess the true Catholic faith, enjoy communion of the sacraments and live under the direction of the Holy Father. They are considered to be parts of the Church.[24] It is this use that the Holy Father seems to be sanctioning in the encyclical. He reserves the use of the term "member" for those who fulfill the above conditions. Carrigan's view of the Pope's statement has little evidence to sustain it. The Pope is speaking of those who are "really" members; this is more than just an official enumeration of those who are considered members. Carrigan's distinction between ordinary and extraordinary member grows out of the conviction that all in the state of grace must be members of the Mystical Body. The concept is not true and thus his distinction has no foundation. The encyclical explicitly states that grace is not numbered among the requirements for membership.[25] This concept of an extraordinary member is not in accord with the encyclical's view of member as one who is a visible part of a visible society.

Finally, Carrigan has not disposed of the objection that this concept conflicts with the doctrine of the visibility of the Church. This concept in fact makes it impossible for us to give firm, clear edges to the Church of Christ. It seems of little avail to protest that "these different means of union with the Church do not affect the Church itself, but individuals."[26] Anything that affects the parts, affects the whole. It was precisely the thesis of St. Robert Bellarmine that the concept of invisible member did affect the visibility of the Church as he indicates in his argument concerning occult heretics: "If we do not know distinctly, who they are who constitute the Church, then we do not know what the Church is, nor where it is, but rather where it is hidden, which indeed is not enough to safeguard the visibility of the Church. . . ."[27] We cannot possibly know who are the invisible or extraordinary members of the Church. Therefore this concept seems to be in conflict with the doctrine of the visibility of the Church.

---

[22] *Ibid.,* 40.

[23] See note 17.

[24] For a history of the development of the term member, see: J. C. Fenton, *"Membership in the Church," AER,* 112 (1945) 293-295.

[25] Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis, AAS* 35 212; Eng. tr. 11.

Carrigan's distinction in regard to membership is not solidly established. His rejection of the *in re-in voto* explanation reverses the recent theological trend.

In the last chapter of *The Salvation of the Nations,* Danielou speaks of the axiom of the Church's necessity. He is about to make the point that the prime missionary motive should be the glory of God rather than the good of men. As a preliminary he refers to the axiom and observes:

> Now most theologians hold that belonging to the visible Church is not absolutely necessary for salvation; there are substitutes for visible membership in the Church, and we can feel justified in believing that souls of good-will outside the Church are saved.
>
> But why, then, do we have missions? If these souls can be saved without visible membership in the Church, why not leave them to their good intention; if Buddhism for some, and Islam for others can prove a way to find God, what need is there of pulling them out of their error and of bringing the Gospel to them?[28]

---

[26] Carrigan, *op. cit.,* 39.

[27] ". . . si non scimus distincte, qui sint, qui Ecclesiam constituunt, non tam sciemus, quae sit Ecclesia, quam ubi sit, seu potius ubi lateat Ecclesia, quod quidem non satis est ad Ecclesiae visibilitatem salvendam. . . ." *De controversiis, Liber* 3. *De ecclesia militante, caput* 10.

[28] "Or la plupart des théologiens disent que l'appartenance à l'Eglise visible n'est pas la condition absolument necessaire du salut; il y a des suppléances

Danielou's answer is that the "source of the apostolate is not necessity but an exigency of love."[29] The prime purpose of the mission is to make Christ known and loved throughout the world, rather than to bring men to the way of salvation. Though the treatment is non-technical, it seems proper to expect more care and closer adherence to the traditional meaning of this teaching concerning the Church. To say without qualification that "belonging to the visible Church is not absolutely necessary for salvation" tends to minimize the importance of the visible Church.

G. Phillips, in *La sainte église catholique,* published in 1947, rejects the use of the body-soul distinction as well as the explanation which applies the doctrine only to those who are outside the Church through their own fault. He uses the *in re-in voto* explanation although he does not employ that terminology. He writes: "All those are saved who, at heart, inhabit the house of God."[30] He does not undervalue the external aspect of the Church. On the contrary he attributes the communication of divine life precisely to this aspect: "We attach great importance to the visible authority and to the sacred signs. By them, life is communicated to us."[31]

Also in 1947, Michalon authored an article in *Irénikon* entitled "L'entendu de l'église." The first section is a presentation of scriptural texts regarding the dimensions of the Church. From these texts, of which he quotes many, the author concludes that

---

à cette appartenance, et nous pouvons penser que les âmes de bonne volonté en dehors de l'Eglise sont sauvéss.

"Mais alors, pourquoi les missions? Si ces âmes peuvent se sauver en dehors de l'appartenance visible a l'Eglise, encore une fois, pourquoi ne pas les laisser dans leur bonne foi; si, pour certaines, les bouddhisme, pour d'autres l'islamisme, peuvent être une voie pour trouver Dieu, quelle necessite y a-t-il à les tirer de leur erreur et á leur apporter l'Evangile?" J. Danielou, *Le mystère du salut des nations* (Paris 1946) 138.

[29] "La source de l'apostolate n'est pas necessité, mais une exigence d'amour." *Loc. cit.*

[30] "Tous ceux-là seront sauvés qui, par le coeur, habitent la maison de Dieu." G. Philips, *La sainte église catholique* (Paris 1947) 282.

[31] "Nous attachons une grande importance à l'autorité visible et aux signes sacrés. Par elle et par eux, la vie nous est communiquée." *Ibid.,* 285.

there is an immense Church "which includes all of humanity."[32] For the redemption affected humanity as a whole; it was constituted as redeemed; by that fact "the Church, the body of Christ coincides with the universe."[33] The author remarks that this thought has not always been well developed by theologians and that a change in approach is necessary in order to give precision to it: "It seems that theological thought will have to progress on the basis of scriptural texts in order to try to attain a more flexible and a richer consciousness of the anthropological and cosmic universality of the Church."[34]

Then the author turns to the conditions which place a person inside this kingdom; they are faith, the sacraments, and union with the visible hierarchy. Finally he is ready to draw his principal conclusion:

> The first conclusion which presents itself—in confining ourselves to the anthropological level—is that no man is absolutely outside the body of the Church. However there is in this body a brilliance which can be more or less intense, like zones of influence of diverse vitality. No pagan, no sinner escapes this influence. In the father's field the tares of the "sons of Satan" are not pulled up; they benefit from the goodness of the master.[35]

In support of this view, the author describes many ties which bind non-Catholic Christians to the visible Church of Christ; for to be bound to Christ is to be bound to His visible Church.

---

[32] ". . . qui embrasse l'humanité entière." P. Michalon, "L'entendue de l'Eglise," *Irenkon* 20 (1947) 146.

[33] ". . . l'Eglise, corps du Christ, finit par coincider avec l'universe." *Ibid.,* 147.

[34] "Il semble que la pensée théologique aura à progresser à partir des texts scripturaires, pour chercher à prendre une conscience plus souple et plus riche de l'univeralisme anthropologique et cosmique de l'Eglise." *Ibid.,* 150.

[35] "La première qui s'impose—pour nous en tenir au plan anthropologique —est qu'aucun homme, n'est absolument en dehors du corps de l'Eglise. Seulement il y a dans ce corps comme des zones d'influence de vitalité diverse, de rayonnement plus ou moins intense. Aucun païen aucun pecher n'y echappe; dans le champe du père de famille, l'ivraie 'les fils du diable' ne sont arrachés; ils benéficient de la bonté du maître." *Ibid.,* 159-160.

Michalon's view of the extension of the Church is questionable. If he intends to signify by it that all people, by the very fact that they are members of the human race, are within the Church in the degree and in the manner necessary in order to be saved, then it would certainly be unacceptable. If this is not his meaning, then further development is needed both to clarify the concept itself and to safeguard the correct notion of the Church's extension. Evidence for his theory is not strong. His use of scripture establishes only that all men are destined for the Church; he argues from this to the fact that from the day of the Cross, the Church has *de facto* included them all *"au plan anthropologique."* These concepts are not referred explicitly to the doctrine of the Church's necessity; but they could be used in such a way as to remove much of the urgency from that doctrine.

In his *Theologia fundamentalis,* Parente expresses the necessity of the Church in this proposition: "The Roman Catholic Church has been so instituted by Christ that it is necessary with the necessity of means for every man to pertain to it as the only ark of salvation."[36] Without elaborating, Parente merely states this necessity of means and indicates that sometime it can be satisfied in desire.

Hasseveldt's *Le mystère de l'église in Christo et in ecclesia* dates from 1948 when it appeared in Lille at the *Grand Seminaire.* He divides his explanation into two parts: "The Solution for the separated Churches" in which he adopts the explanation of Karl Adam and the "Solution for the Human Community" in which he quotes freely from de Montcheuil, Congar and Journet. He quotes extensively from these authors to present the Catholic Church as the *full* participation in the divine life; but since the various dissident denominations contain "elements of the Church" they are "fruitful to the degree in which they are Catholic."[37]

This same year, 1948, saw the appearance of several periodical articles which gave careful scrutiny to the two sections of the encyclical concerned with "belonging to the Church." These articles are of great importance since they reveal how the words of the Holy Father were accepted by theologians; many of these differ from the interpretation of Tromp presented above. These divergent views greatly affect the understanding of the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation.

---

[36] "Ecclesia Romano-Catholica talis est ex Christi institutione ut ad eam pertinere, tamquam unicam arcam salutis, necessarium cuique sit necessitate medii." P. Parente, *Theologia Fundamentalis* (ed. altera, Romae 1947) 142.

[37] R. Hasseveldt, *The Church: a Divine Mystery,* trans. W. Storey (Chicago 1954) 237.

The rather sharp difference of opinion which existed among the theologians concerning the Holy Father's meaning is clearly exemplified in an article which appeared in the *Thomist* in January of that year. It was entitled "Mystici Corporis and the Soul of the Church." In this article the author took strong objection to a few earlier commentaries on the encyclical. Those commentaries[38] credited the encyclical with "restricting the membership of the Mystical Body and discrediting at least one outstanding book on the subject" and with abolishing "the distinction between the body and soul of the Church."[39] The author of the *Thomist* article undertook to disprove both of these contentions by showing that the encyclical does *not* teach that the visible Catholic Church and the Mystical Body are co-extensive; nor does it reject the use of the body-soul distinction in explaining the necessity of the Church.

His case is based upon the contention that only culpable separation from the Church deprives one of the membership in the Mystical Body. There is nothing new, he states, in the Pope's statement that those who are "divided in faith or government" are not members of the Mystical Body. But, he adds, "all theologians insist that this separation from the Church must be voluntary, deliberate, intentional, culpable."[40] It is this culpable refusal to hear the Church which causes the break from unity in the Mystical Body. This, he claims, is the theological tradition and there is no indication that the Holy Father has abandoned this view:

---

[38] The writings to which the author takes exception are: J. C. Fenton, "The Use of the Terms Body and Soul with Reference to the Catholic Church," *AER* 110 (1944) 48; An answer to a question about the Mystical Body given by F. Connell, C.SS.R. in *AER* 115 (1946) 62; and a review of F. Jurgenmeier's "The Mystical Body of Christ as the Basic Principle of Religious Life," written by J. Bluett, S.J. in *TS* 8 (1947) 338. All of these interpreted the encyclical as equating the Mystical Body with the Roman Catholic Church.

[39] I. McGuiness, O.P., "Mystici Corporis and the Soul of the Church," *The Thomist,* 1. (1948) 19.

[40] *Ibid.,* 22.

> It is one thing to say that those who have deliberately cut themselves off from the Church are thereby cut off from the Mystical Body; it is quite another to say that those who are outside the Church through no fault of their own and whose souls are the dwelling place of the Holy Ghost are cut off from the Mystical Christ through Whose Sacred Humanity all graces come to men. The first is Papal teaching; the second would be worthy of censure, because of the slight it would cast on the universality of the Redemption and the sanctifying activities of the Holy Ghost.[41]

On the basis of this, the author concludes:

> Thus the teaching of Pius XII on the actual membership of the Church and the Mystical Body and its restriction to those in communion with the Holy See does not contradict the statement that the Mystical Body is not limited to those who belong visibly to the Church. Nor does a passage quoted apart from its context abolish the traditional distinction between belonging visibly to the Church's body and invisibly to its soul.[42]

Turning to the matter of the body-soul distinction in greater detail, the author observes that the most effective citation to support the contention of those who deplore the expression "soul of the Church" is the section of the encyclical which rejects the distinction between the juridic Church and the Church of charity. However this text has not been properly understood:

> This forthright condemnation is taken to apply to the explanation found in nearly all treatises on the salvation of infidels and those outside the Church, by which the axiom *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* is reconciled with the fact that some are saved outside the Church. That they are saved shows that they belong to the Church, that they

---

[41] *Ibid.,* 23.
[42] *Ibid.,* 24.

> were infidels leaves them outside the Church, hence they are said to belong to the soul, and not to the body of the Church.[43]

In this text, the Holy Father is merely condemning the Protestant notion of an invisible Church and the Catholic teaching, "particularly that of the pre-Tridentine theologians whose thought had not been focused on the subterfuges of the Reformers, to hold that men can be of the Church, without partaking of her visible communion."[44] One last point to which the author addresses himself is that of terminology; what to call those who are incorporated into the Church but not visibly. St. Robert Bellarmine suggested the distinction between members of the Church and those who belong to the Church. However the matter is not of great importance provided we realize that such people have life through union with Christ: "to designate that union with Christ we use the word member."[45]

Having presented his case sufficiently, the author states his ultimate conclusion which is directly opposed to the position of the earlier commentators: "Hence it is not contradictory to Papal teaching to say that the Mystical Body is not limited to those who belong visibly to the Church; nor is it condemned to speak of justified infidels belonging to the soul of the Church, for if they are justified, they live in an inner vital union with Christ and as St. Ignatius of Antioch declared long ago, 'wherever Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church.' "[46]

Such a position reflects the attitude with which some theologians read the encyclical. Convinced as they were that union with Christ in grace constituted membership in His Mystical Body, they understood the words of the encyclical as favoring that view. Here the distinction is made between culpable and inculpable separation from the Church. As a result, a text which seemed so clear to some theologians is here interpreted in an opposite sense: the visible Church and the Mystical body are not co-extensive.

---

[43] *Ibid.*, 26.

[44] *Loc. cit.*

[45] *Ibid.*, 27.

[46] *Loc. cit.*

If that point was still arguable in 1948, the uselessness of the body-soul distinction in regard to the Church's necessity was clear. The author's statement that it is used in "nearly all treatises on the salvation of infidels" fails to take into account the fact that an increasing number of theologians from the time of Caperan have rejected this as a true expression of Catholic doctrine. By 1948 that rejection was widespread, as the foregoing pages testify.

Finally the author's use of the term member to designate all those who have a "union with Christ" indicates no awareness of a "union with Christ" which is less than membership.

The same year a long article in three parts was published in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* entitled "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church." It was written by J. C. Fenton. In the first part of this article the author calls attention to the particular difficulty encountered in treating this subject, commenting that some authors "attempt to explain it away rather than objectively to explain its meaning."[47] Modern authors use six basic formulas, not all of which express the doctrine accurately. Having taken notice of this situation, the author turns to the magisterial documents stating that any theological demonstration should begin with an examination of the various authentic declarations of the Church upon the subject under discussion. He explains in detail the statements of the IV Lateran Council, the Bull *Unam Sanctam,* the Decree for the Jacobites and the *Singulari quadam* of Pius IX. He is emphatic in rejecting any use of the body-soul distinction: "It is of course, impossible to make any rational or accurate use of the term 'soul of the Church' in explaining the necessity of the Catholic Church for eternal salvation."[48]

In the second section of the article, the author examines the *Quanto conficiamur moerere* of Pius IX, pointing out that clearly the Pope does not require actual membership in the Church as a necessary requisite for salvation. Nor have any of the documents examined required actual membership. What has always been required is that the person be inside the Church in some way, but not necessarily as a member: "The doctrine that a man can be 'inside the Church,' in the sense of being in a position to receive eternal salvation, while he is not actually a member of that Church, which is a visible and highly organized society, is obviously something quite difficult to teach accurately and adequately. Yet this doctrine is nothing more or less than the truth manifestly revealed by God to His Church."[49] This concept of being inside the Church has been expressed in Catholic theology in terms of a desire, explicit or implicit: "According to the divine revelation, infallibly proposed in the dogma of the Church, both the members of this society and those who sincerely, even though only implicitly, desire to live within it, are 'inside the Church' in such a way as to be able to live the life of sanctifying grace which is the beginning of eternal salvation."[50]

---

[47] J. C. Fenton, "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER* 118 (1948) 214.

[48] *Ibid.,* 219.

The third section of the article is given over to an examination of the scriptural evidence, which has been largely neglected by the theologians:

> They have not integrated the basic scriptural theology of salvation itself into their demonstration, and thereby they have overlooked what can and should be a decisively effective factor in this proof. Scripture itself shows salvation as essentially involving a social concept. It is the divine gift by which a man is transferred, by the beneficent power of God, from one social entity to another.[51]

So here we have a detailed examination of the documents of the magisterium, with the general conclusion that they require some connection with the Church as an absolute necessity for salvation; the use of the body-soul distinction is rejected. These, as we have seen, are views which found increasing approval among theologians; here the foundation for such views is shown to rest solidly upon the principal documents concerned with the doctrine. Attention is called to the confusion, and even inaccuracy among several modern approaches to the question; and an effort is made to use effectively the scriptural evidence for the doctrine. Of special interest is the view that we can say, on the basis of the magisterial documents, that it is possible to be "in the Church" in a degree necessary for salvation, without being a member.

---

[49] *Ibid.*, 293.

[50] *Ibid.*, 302.

[51] *Ibid.*, 362-363.

Chavasse in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* of the same year wrote an article entitled *"Ordonnés au Corps Mystique. . . ."* This is a profound study of the two passages of the encyclical describing the relationship of men to the Mystical Body. The meaning of the first passage rests upon a proper understanding of the word *reapse.* For this whole passage merely describes authentic members of the Church. It must be understood as being set against the terminology *voto ac desiderio* used in the second text.

In developing his interpretation of this second text, Chavasse understands the Holy Father to be saying that *all* of the separated possess a relationship to the Church by virtue of an unconscious desire and longing. This is something ontological which all men separated from the Church possess. In explaining this, he first calls attention to the context of the passage. The Holy Father is speaking to all the separated, urging them to withdraw from a state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation and to enter the Church where they will possess the plenitude of heavenly aid:

> This opposition between the situation in which all those separated from the visible organism of the Church find themselves and the situation which would be theirs in the Catholic Church, is sufficient to justify the appeal to enter the Church which is addressed to them. For the Pope does not say that salvation is impossible for them in their present condition, but only that they cannot be "assured" of it; he does not say that before entering the Church that they are radically without any relation to her, but merely that the relation that they can have with her does not put at their disposition the plenitude (*tot tantisque*) of aids which they would have at their disposition in the Church.[52]

---

[52] "Cette opposition entre la situation dans laquelle se trouvent tous ceux qui sont separés de l'organisme visible de l'Eglise et la situation qu'ils trouveraient dans l'Eglise catholique, suffit à justifier l'appel qui leur est adressé d'entrer dans l'Eglise. Car le pape ne dit pas que le salut leur soit impossible dans l'état où ils se trouvent, mais seulement qu'ils n'en peuvent être 'assurés'; il ne dit pas non plus qu'avant d'entrer ainsi dans l'Eglise ils

Examining this relation which the separated have with the Church, Chavasse quotes St. Robert Bellarmine's use of the terms *in re* and *in voto* and remarks that this is not the sense in which the words of Pius XII are to be taken. The Pontiff has indeed used the term *voto* but he has changed its significance:

> Pius XII, who is treating of "separated" pagans and dissidents, modifies somewhat the usual formula. For indeed it seems difficult to speak of these people as Suarez has, namely in terms of *a desire of entering the* Church; in this sense that they would consciously desire to enter the Catholic Church. Also Pius XII speaks of an "unconscious desire, attempting to convey with one expression that the ontological situation of the separated person ordains him to the Church and that he himself remains unaware of it.[53]

Here Chavasse makes no provision for the concept of an implicit *votum,* long in use by theologians. Furthermore in a footnote to the foregoing, he shows little liking for such a concept: "Suarez was already aware of the forced usage which is made of the word desire when mention is made of a *desire of entering the Church* in regard to any non-baptized believer (quicumque fidelis) and not merely in regard to catechumens. This is why he came to speak of a *votum saltem implicitum."*[54] So Chavasse rejects the very

---

sont radicalement sans rapport avec elle, mais seulement que le rapport qu'ils peuvent soutenir avec elle, est tel qu'il ne met pas à leur disposition la plénitude (tot tantisque) des secours qu'ils auraient à leur disposition dans l'Eglise." A. Chavasse, "Ordonnés au Corps Mystique. . . ." *NRT* 70 (1948) 696.

[53] "Pie XII, qui traite de 'séparés' païens et dissidents modifie quelque peu la formule habitelle. Il semble difficile, en effet, de parler à leur sujet, comme le fait Suarez, d'un *votum ingrediendi ecclesiam,* en ce sens qu'ils désireraient consciemment entrer dans l'Eglise catholique. Aussi Pie XII parle-t-il d'un désir 'inconscient' (*inscio*), essayant de faire comprendre à la fois que la situation ontologique du séparé l'ordonne à l'Eglise et qu'il ne s'en rend pas compte lui-même." *Ibid.,* 697.

[54] "Suarez s'était déjà rendu compte de l'usage forcé qui est fait du mot désir quand à propos de n'importe quel croyant (quicumque fidelis) non baptisé—et non plus seulement du catéchumène—*on parle de votum ingrediendi ecclesiam.* Aussi en arrivait-il à parler d'un *votum saltem implicitum." Ibid.,* 697, noté.

concept of a *votum implicitum* in favor of an ontological ordination to the Church; it is this latter concept that he predicates of the Pope's text.

According to Chavasse, the reason for this change is found in the very notions of salvation and attachment to the Church. The two are not totally convertible. All men must be attached to the Church to be saved, but not all who are attached to the Church will be saved. Just as Pius XII distinguished saints and sinners among the members of the Church, so the same distinction must be made among those ordained to the Church. Chavasse observes: "Therefore are we authorized to conclude from the fact that the dissident in good faith can be saved, whereas the obstinate dissident cannot, that only the former is attached to the Church in some way and that the latter has no connexion with it at all?"[55] The very manner in which the Holy Father speaks suggests that the Pope does not want to exclude the possibility that even dissidents in bad faith may be attached to the Church. The Holy Father is exhorting all to enter the Church, and so he can affirm that though all are ordained to the Church, they are in an inferior position. Chavasse is sure that this is the true meaning of the text:

> . . . he merely intends to indicate the defective situation of all dissidents without distinction, in regard to salvation, for the purpose of drawing out of this an argument inviting *all* to enter into the Catholic unity. This is why he can without difficulty speak of all dissidents without distinction when he states that their "ordination" to the Church does not offer to any one of them the plenitude of aids which can be found in her only by the man who belongs to her fully.[56]

---

[55] "Dés lors, du fait que le séparé de bonne foi peut être sauvé, tandis que le séparé obstiné ne peut l'être, est-on autorisé à conclure que le premier seul est rattaché d'une certaine façon à l'Eglise, et que le second ne soutient plus avec elle aucun rapport?" *Ibid.,* 701.

[56] ". . . il se propose simplement de marquer la situation défectueuse de *tout* séparé, sans distinction, en face du salut, en vue d'en tirer argument pour les inviter *tous* à entrer dans l'unité catholique. Aussi peut-il sans difficulté parler indistinctement de *tous* les séparés, quand il affirme que leur 'ordination' à l'Eglise n'offre à aucun d'entre eux la plénitude des secours qu'on ne peut trouver en elle qu'en lui appartenant pleinement." *Loc. cit.*

This interpretation of the text by Chavasse certainly differs from that of earlier commentators. They understood the text to mean that non-Catholics should withdraw themselves from a state wherein they cannot be sure of their salvation, even though *some* of them *may* be related to the Mystical Body by an unconscious desire and longing. In this interpretation the unconscious desire and longing is clearly the traditional *votum implicitum* of Bellarmine and Suarez. The Holy Father is saying that even though the people who possess this can be saved, they still remain in a distinctly inferior position in comparison to those who are members of the Mystical Body.

Chavasse has Pius XII describing something other than this *votum implicitum;* a general ontological "ordination" to the Church which all men possess by the very fact that they exist. Now it would seem that Chavasse has given the passage a deeper meaning than it contains; and he has given the passage a strange tone; for if the Pope were merely describing the universal *relatio in potentia* of all men to the Mystical Body, the phrase chosen would seem ill suited to his purpose. Also he has risked confusing theologians by using the term *votum* in a manner which differs from its long-accepted meaning. Thirdly it is difficult to see where "*inscio quodam desiderio ac voto*" can indicate an ontological relation; for a desire and a yearning are psychological and the *inscio* could well be taken as indicating a desire that is only implicitly present in another desire. Chavasse has placed great emphasis on the term *inscio,* to the extent of distorting the whole phrase. This coupled with his repudiation of the traditional concept of a *votum implicitum* seems to be the basis of his interpretation. Fourthly, and this is the strongest argument against Chavasse's interpretation, the attachment which the Holy Father describes in the text is sufficient to make salvation possible. Therefore it must be something more than the universal ordination of all men to the Mystical Body. Otherwise we would be forced to hold that the whole human race by the very force of its redemption by Christ is attached to the Church in the degree necessary for salvation. Such an interpretation would leave no meaning to the axiom "Outside the Church no salvation."

In conclusion then, while there is a certain ordination of the whole human race to the Church, this is not the attachment which is mentioned by Pius XII. Too many difficulties prevent the acceptance of this interpretation. Earlier commentators seem to have understood it correctly as describing the *votum implicitum* long understood by theologians. True, the Holy Father speaks of an "ordination" instead of an "attachment" to the Church; but this does not seem to have the significance which Chavasse attached to it. However he has called attention to a precision in terminology which must be weighed by theologians.

In the same issue of the *Nouvelle revue théologique,* Morel wrote an article entitled *"Le Corps mystique du Christ et l'église catholique."* Herein is developed another interpretation of the two pertinent sections of the encyclical. Morel disagrees with Tromp's view concerning the criteria for determining the proper sense of the term "Mystical Body." Not too much reliance is to be placed upon the documents of the magisterium since therein, more often than not, scripture is used in an accommodated sense. The proper sense of the term "Mystical Body" is to be sought in the scriptures themselves. There the proper sense is bound up with the habitual sharing of the life of Christ: "Thus *Body of Christ* signifies that Christians, because they receive life from Christ, are a spiritual organism which has its life in Christ, which depends on Christ (genitive)."[57] This might seem to clash with the encyclical's interpretation of the scriptural doctrine, but actually this is not so: ". . . the encyclical does not propose its interpretation as the *strict sense* of the Mystical Body of Christ, nor as the *fundamental scriptural sense;* it is content to expose a doctrine in the framework of known scriptural terms, presenting them in a *partially accommodated sense."*[58] Thus the Mystical Body is really the society of those sharing the life of Christ; the encyclical's view is based upon an accommodated use of scripture; but this is not to deny the teaching of the encyclical. Here Morel advances a distinction to harmonize his view with that teaching. For the term "Mystical Body" can be taken in two proper senses: a simple proper sense and an eminent proper sense. Thus: "Whoever lives authentically with the life of Christ will be, in the proper but simple sense, a member of the Mystical Body. In as much as only the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ, and only she represents the will of Christ fully, then it is only the members of this Church who are members of the Mystical Body in the perfect and eminent sense of the word."[59] On the basis of this distinction, there is great difficulty in calling the Roman Catholic Church the Mystical Body; for you would thereby exclude all those non-Catholics in the state of grace who are members of the Mystical Body in the simple sense of that term. There is a reasonableness in this generous view of the condition of non-Catholics for the grace of God "is not tied to the seven sacraments instituted by him, not to the institute of salvation which is the true Church of Christ."[60] Nor does the doctrine of the Church's necessity create any problem in accepting this distinction for: "The Catholic dogma which maintains that 'outside the Church there is no salvation' actually is concerned only with *formal* heretics and schismatics."[61]

---

[57] "Ainsi, *corps du Christ* dit que les chrétiens, parce qu'ils reçoivent la vie du Christ, sont un organisme spirituel qui a sa vie dans le Christ, qui dépend du Christ (génitif)." V. Morel, "Le Corps Mystique du Christ et l'Eglise catholique," *NRT* 70 (1948) 705.

[58] ". . . l'encyclique ne propose pas son interprétation comme le *sens strict* du Corps mystique du Christ ni comme le *sens primordial de la sainte Ecriture;* elle se contente d'exposer une doctrine dans le cadre de termes scripturaires connus, en présentant ceux-ci dans un *sens partiellement accommadatrice." Ibid.,* 707.

It would seem that the people whom Morel calls members of the Mystical Body in the simple sense of the word are those whom the encyclical describes as having a certain relationship to the

---

[59] "Quiconque vit authentiquement de la vie du Christ sera, au sens propre mais simple, membre du Corps mystique. Comme seule, l'Eglise catholique romaine est la véritable Eglise du Christ, et qu'elle représente seule pleinement ce qu'a voulu J. C., il n'y a que les membres de cette Eglise qui sont, au sens parfait en éminent du mot, membres du Corps mystique." *Ibid.*, 709.

[60] ". . . c'est une vérité théologique certaine que Dieu dans la distribution de la grâce, même sanctifiante, n'est pas lié aux sept sacrements par lui institués, ni a l'institution de salut qu'est la véritable Eglise du Christ." *Loc. cit.*

[61] "La dogme catholique que 'hors de l'Eglise catholique il n'y a pas de salut' regarde en effect que les seuls hérétiques et schismatiques formels." *Ibid.*, 711.

Mystical Body. Morel also explains away this difficulty: "Certainly the encyclical on the Mystical Body affirms that those who do not belong to the visible organism of the Catholic Church are only 'ordained to the Mystical Body of the redeemer by a certain unconscious desire and yearning'; but here it is using Mystical Body in the proper and eminent sense of the term, as synonymous with the Roman Catholic Church."[62] These individuals still remain really members of the Mystical Body, but in the proper and simple sense of the term. The expression *ordinentur* is well-suited to describe the relation of a separated Christian to the Church because

> . . . it puts emphasis on the *ontological* order of that attachment. Actually the supernatural gifts which the separated person possesses and by which he is really, but in the *simple sense* a member of the Mystical Body, cannot, according to the divine will and their internal ontological structure, obtain their full flowering except in the Catholic Church which for this reason calls itself the Mystical Body in the *proper and eminent sense* of the word.[63]

In summing up the relation of the Mystical Body to the Catholic Church Morel concludes that the Roman Catholic Church is the Mystical Body *par excellence;* but *"sur le plan réel"* the Mystical Body is larger than the Roman Catholic Church.

Morel's distinction between members in the simple proper sense and the eminent proper sense lacks any traditional foundation and seems illogical. For the members in an eminent sense are Catholics, who may or may not possess the life of Christ; while all the non-Catholic members are those who have an habitual union with Christ and yet they are members only in the simple sense. He advances no reason for his statement that the encyclical is using scripture in an accommodated sense and is not defining the proper, original, basic sense of the term "Mystical Body."

---

[62] "Certes, l'encyclique sur le Corps mystique affirme que ceux qui n'appartiennent pas à l'organisme visible de l'Eglise catholique ne sont qu'ordonnés au corps mystique du Rédempteur par un certain désir et voeu inconscient' mais elle entend ici le Corps mystique au sens propre et éminent du terme, comme synonyme donc de l'Eglise catholique romaine." *Loc. cit.*

[63] ". . . elle met l'accent sur l'ordre *ontologique* de ce rattachement. En effet, les dons surnaturels, que possède le séparé et par lesquels il est réellement, mais *au sens simple simplement* membre du Corps mystique, ne peuvent, suivant la volonté divine et d'après leur structure ontologique interne obtenir leur plein épanouissement que dans l'Eglise catholique, qui s'appelle dès lors le corps mystique au *sense propre et éminent* du mot." *Loc. cit.*

His revival of the view that the dogma of the Church's necessity regards only formal heretics is a return to a position long abandoned by theologians. Finally Morel does bring a new precision to the concept of the "ordination" of non-Catholics to the Mystical Body. He views this relation, as did Chavasse, as an ontological one. Grace comes immediately to the person and sanctifies him, establishing an ontological relation to the visible Church. Thus Morel does not predicate this relation of all those who are not members of the Church, but only of those already sharing in the life of Christ. This attachment is a result rather than a cause of salvation.

In October of the same year, Liegé considers the Pope's statements in a much quoted and highly regarded article in the *Revue des sciences philolophiques et théologiques* entitled *"L'appartenance a l'Église et l'encyclicque 'Mystici Corporis.'"* He states that at first glance it would seem that the Pope had adopted St. Robert Bellarmine's definition of member but this is not the case at all:

> In reality the encyclical does not adopt that theology of Bellarmine which separates too much the two aspects of the Church in order to give finally an almost exclusive importance to the juridic elements. The definition . . . certainly places its foundation upon the visible elements of belonging, but these assume and symbolize the presence of the pneumatological elements, in conformity with the doctrine of the Church as Mystical Body.[64]

---

[64] "En réalité l'encyclique n'adopte pas cette théologie de Bellarmin qui sépare trop les deux aspects de l'Eglise pour accorder finalement une importance presque exclusive aux elements juridiques. La définition citée plus haut prend sans doute son appui sur les éléments visibles d'appartenance, mais ceux-ci sous-entendent et symbolisent, conformément à la doctrine générale du Corps-mystique Eglise, la présence des éléments de pneumatisme." P. A. Liégé, "L'appartenance à l'Eglise et l'Encyclique 'Mystici Corporis,'" *RSPT.* 32 (1948) 352.

The proof of this is found in the passage following, which states that all sinners do not lose their membership in the Church since every sin does not deprive them of all life as does heresy or schism. Because of the fact that not every sin deprives them of *all* life, they retain their status of membership. So Liegé reasons that the Holy Father is pointing to the fact that the possession of life in Christ is a constitutive element of the status of membership. Liegé further observes that for the Holy Father "member" signifies the possession of life in Christ as well as the external signs of union with the Church:

> In the question of members of the Mystical Body, the encyclical does not separate belonging to the institution of salvation from belonging to the community of salvation. According to the fullness of its teaching he is properly called a member of the Mystical Body of Christ who lives in its visible organism according to the totality of the elements which compose it . . . and who possess within himself the fruit of that insertion in the visible organism. . . .[65]

That fruit is the possession of charity for healthy members and the possession of faith and hope for infirm members.

Turning next to those who are related to the Mystical Body, Liegé offers a parallel interpretation of their status:

> Here again it is by immediate reference to the Mystical Body in its elements of visibility that the encyclical formulates the status of the secret members of Christ: in a word they do not belong to the Mystical Body, they are only ordained to it by the implicit richness of the spiritual dispositions by means of which they can be justified; dispositions which are summed up in the general will to obey God in submitting to everything which they recognize in conscience as stemming from that

---

[65] "L'encycliqe ne sépare donc pas, dans la question des membres de Corps mystique, l'appartenance à l'institution de salut de l'appartenance à 'la communauté' de salut. Au terme de son enseignement est membre proprement dit du corps mystique du Christ celui qui vit dans son organisme visible, selon la totalité des éléments que le composent . . . et qui possède en soi le fruit de cette insertion dans l'organisme visible. . . ." *Ibid.,* 353.

> divine economy of salvation which finds its full realization in the Church. The elements of the visible Church which the dissidents find in their confession are given the value of tending to the plenitude of the Church by this desire and yearning, which is addressed, unbeknown to them, to the Catholic Church. We can understand the insistence of the Holy Father in presenting the visible Church to these members-in-tendency as the only place where redemption is brought to full maturity. For that unconscious ordination of which the encyclical speaks can be sufficient for the salvation of certain men only because it calls for a more complete actuation through relation to which it is defined and which exists only among the baptized who lead the totality of the Church-life.[66]

The importance of the visible aspects is clear; further the elements of the Church present in the dissident sects take their efficacy from the desire of the individual concerned. Thus these elements are not means in themselves, but must be used in dependence upon the Church and this is precisely what the *votum* accomplishes for them.

In drawing his conclusions from these considerations, Liegé states that the encyclical contains the principles from which two possible definitions of belonging to the Church may be evolved. One is the pastoral definition which is the one the Pope gives and which defines membership in function of "the juridic elements considered as indications of the presence of the spiritual elements."[67] This definition is necessary since the Church simply must know who are her members and who are not. The purpose of this definition is, then, juridic.

---

[66] "Ici encore, c'est par réference immediate au Corps mystique en ses éléments de visibilité que l'encyclique formule le statut des membres secrets du Christ: à parler nettement ils n'appartiennent pas au Corps Mystique: ils lui sont seulement ordonnés par la richesse implicite des dispositione spirituelles moyen lesquells ils on pu être justifiés; dispositions qui se résument dans la volonté générale d'obéir à Dieu en se soumettant à tout ce qu'ils reconnaîtront en conscience relever de cette économie divine du salut qui trouve sa réalisation plenière dans l'Eglise. Les elements d'Eglise visible qui les dissidents trouvent dans leur confession prennent eux-memes valeur de tendance a la plenitude d'Eglise *dans ce désir et ce souhait* (italics added) qui s'adressent, à leur insu, à l'Eglise catholique. . . . Car cette ordination inconsciente dont parle l'encyclique ne peut être suffisante pour le salut de certains que parce qu'elle appelle une actuation plus complète par rapport à laquelle elle se définit et qui existe chez les baptisés partiquant la totalité de la vie ecclésiale." *Ibid.*, 354.

The second definition of membership takes notice of the fact that the Church has a mystical and a juridic aspect, which by right are inseparable one from the other. Thus a theological definition of membership can

> place its foundation on the spiritual elements, considered as involving instrumentally the presence of the juridic elements. . . . From this theological point of view he will be a member of the Church who possesses within himself some part of the divine life communicated in Christ, and also, as a conditional and subordinated qualification, the exterior marks of his insertion in the institute of salvation.[68]

Normally the community life and the possession of the life of Christ should accompany one another; however the former can sometimes be very restricted, as wtih non-Catholic Christians; or even non-existent, as with pagans; nevertheless these people are authentic members of the Church. In respect to the visible community life however, they are imperfect members. Thus we can speak of "imperfect, partial, yet real belonging to the Church"[69] whenever we find a non-Catholic who possesses either grace or faith.

Liegé has called attention to an importance nuance concerning the concept of membership. Certainly the definition of member is made with reference to the visible aspects of the Church; but to those visible aspects as containing and signifying the invisible aspects. Liegé finds support for this view in the passage of the encyclical concerning sinful Catholics. Since they remain members because of the fact that all life is not lost to them, then participation—at least to some extent—in the life of Christ is an element of membership.

---

[67] ". . . les éléments juridiques considérés comme révélateurs de la présence des éléments spirituels." *Ibid.*, 356.

[68] ". . . prendait son appui sur les éléments spirituels considérés comme entrainant à titre instrumental la présence des éléments juridiques. . . . De ce point de vue théologique sera dit membre de l'Eglise qui possèdera en lui quelque chose de la vie divine communiquée dans le Christ, et, à titre conditionnel et subordonné, les marques extérieures de son insertion dans l'institut de salut." *Ibid.*, 356-357.

[69] ". . . appartenance partielle et imparfaite mais réelle a l'Èglise." *Ibid.*, 357.

However in speaking of *membres secrets* and *membres en tendence,* Liegé seems to be extending the Pope's use of the term member. Liegé's argument that life in Christ (charity for healthy members, faith and hope for infirm members) enters into the integral concept of membership seems to be a cogent one. However—and this seems to us to be the vital consideration—when the Holy Father came to define the concept of membership he made no mention of this life but gave that definition precisely in terms of visible union with the Church. Furthermore when the Holy Father described the situation of those who are related to the Church, he did not employ the term member. This seems to indicate that the definition he has given of membership is one which expresses all the *essential* elements necessary to make a person a member of the Church. All of these essential elements are susceptible to external verification. When they are all present we can speak of membership; where any one is lacking, we cannot speak of membership. This seems to be the meaning of the phrase which introduces the definition: *"In Ecclesiae autem membris reapse ii soli annumerandi sunt. . ."*

In the design of God, every membership should be an integral membership. That is, it should include the possession of grace. Yet human perversity can prevent this. Likewise in the design of God, every possession of vital union with Christ should be effected through membership. Yet human ignorance can prevent this. This distinction between the integral concept of membership and the essential concept of membership seems valid as long as it is clearly recognized that the essential elements of membership are those enumerated by Pope Pius XII and that where any of these essential elements are lacking, there simply is no membership.

Whether this distinction between the integral and essential elements of membership proves to be useful or not, it still seems certain that any application of the term member to individuals who cannot be included in the Holy Father's definition runs the risk of obscuring the fundamental teaching of the encyclical.

Liegé's interpretation of the second text of the encyclical is more precise. For him the attachment described by the Pope is founded upon personal spiritual dispositions; he equates it, as did Tromp, with the traditional *votum* of the theologians. His view of the elements of the visible Church which exist among the dissidents insists upon the need these elements have of this personal *votum* to render them effective. They are not means in themselves; but derive their efficacy in individual cases from the personal dispositions of the person involved. In this interpretation he has effectively rejected the view that these elements are in some way, means of salvation in themselves.

In the *Revue des sciences religieuses* for October of the same year there appeared an article written by Bouyer entitled *"Où en est la théologie du Corps mystique?"* It recounts the recent trends regarding the doctrine of the Mystical Body and insists that the clear evidence of history, in spite of some recent works, is that the Mystical Body and the Roman Catholic Church are the same entity. He weighs the effect of a renewed spiritual life, a vigorous Catholic action, and the movement known as ecumenism upon this doctrine of the Mystical Body. This last tried to justify the authentic spiritual realities in non-Catholic religions so as to facilitate the return of non-Catholics; such an attempt was not without serious consequences for the traditional doctrine concerning the Mystical Body. Speaking of ecumenism, Bouyer observes:

> Not wishing to compromise with the fundamental Catholic principle, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus,* it was alleging the discovery of hidden, or if you prefer, mystic, ways whereby the spirituality of dissident Christians could be attached to the life of the Church. At this time the notion of the Mystical Body came to the fore. Constituted by our participation in grace in the life of Christ, spreading itself across all the conscious and unconscious contacts of the Spirit with humanity, even in the most "laicized" regions, does not the Mystical Body profoundly effect this very attachment of all that is Christian to the Catholic unity? For it is only too evident that the hierarchy and the sacraments procure the

> visible privilege of this unity for only a part of Christianity. From this viewpoint there stemmed a dialectic opposition between "Mystical Body" and "Church in her visible aspect." This was still entirely hidden in the spiritual realm; it was implicit in the realm of Catholic Action and its divers extensions; but ecumenism alone would bring it to full light.[70]

Bouyer makes explicit mention of the work of Congar examined above; but he finds in this work no evidence of the ecumenical tendency he is describing. Rather it was the theologians who followed Congar; they lacked his precision and thus tended to distinguish between the Mystical Body and the "Church in its visible aspect."

Bouyer insists at great length that such a distinction is not found either in the documents of revelation, or those of tradition. Thus the recent authors who attempt to establish such a distinction have no foundation for their view. He continues:

> Furthermore, we should acknowledge that it is precisely from the Church-society that the notion of "body" expresses unity. If this unity is none the less primarily spiritual, this underlines all the more that it is this Church herself, as such, which must be considered as the great spiritual reality of Christianity and not anything else, as closely co-ordinated to it as we suppose it to be.

---

[70] "Si l'on ne volait pas transiger avec le principe catholique fondamental, *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus,* cela supposait la découverte de voies souterraines, ou mystique si l'on préfère, par lesquelles la spiritualité des chrétiens dissidents pourrait être rattaché à la vie de l'Eglise. C'est ici que la notion du Corps mystique a paru surgir a point nommé. Constitué par notre participation dans la grâce à la vie même du Christ, s'élaborant à travers tous les cheminements conscients ou inconscients, de l'Esprit dans l'humanité, jusque sous les régions les plus 'laïques,' le corps mystique n'opérait-il pas en profondeur ce rattachement de tout ce qu'il y a de chrétien à l'unité catholique, dont il est trop évident que la hierarchie et les sacrements ne procurent le privilège visible qu'à une partie de la chretienté? D'où la mise au jour d'une opposition dialectique entre 'corps mystique' et 'Eglise sous son aspect visible,' encore entièrement latente dans le domaine spirituel, déjà sous-jacente dans celui de l'Action Catholique et de ses divers prolongements, mais que seul l'oecuménisme devait amener à la pleine lumière" L. Bouyer, "Où en est la théologie du Corps mystique." *RSR,* 22 (1948) 319.

> There is not, in Christianity, a Church-body of Christ which would be spiritual and a Church-society which would be the instrument or the corporeity (in the proper sense) of the spiritual Church. It is the Church-society which is designated by the expression "Body of Christ"; precisely as a society, and as a society wherein the unity, basically spiritual, is affirmed in the very visibility of the social organism.[71]

So two observations can be made pertinent to the doctrine of the Church's necessity. First, at least a certain portion of ecumenism advanced the premise for distinguishing between the Church in its visible reality and the Mystical Body. This premise was the view that the Catholic element in non-Catholic religions was in some way the cause of salvation. This premise is implicitly rejected by Bouyer. Secondly, he seems to reject any distinction between the Church and the Mystical Body, even the distinction which views one as the instrument of the other. He is adamant in identifying the two as one reality.

Also in 1948 Calcagno published his *Theologia Fundamentalis*. He expresses the doctrine thus: "From the will of Christ, for all men to attain salvation, union with the body of the Church 1) is necessary, 2) with the necessity of means, 3) *in re* or *in voto*."[72] However his methodology is poor; he equates this union with the Church with membership and it is this membership that is necessary *in re* or *in voto*. In explaining the axiom, he states that it does not apply to those who are outside the Church through no fault of their town. He regards the *votum* as psychological, not ontological; taking no notice of the articles treated above.

---

[71] "Qui plus est, nous devons reconnaître que c'est précisement de l'Eglise-société que la notion du 'corps' exprime l'unité. Si cette unité n'en est pas moins spirituelle au premier chef, cela souligne d'autant mieux que c'est cette Eglise elle-même, en tant que telle, qui doit être considérée comme la grande réalité spirituelle du christianisme et non pas autre chose, aussi étroitement coordonné à elle qu'on le suppose. Il n'y a pas, dans les christianisme, une Eglise-corps du Christ qui serait spirituelle et une Eglise-société qui serait l'instrument ou la corporéité (au sense propre) de l'Eglise spirituelle. C'est l'Eglise-société qui est designée par l'expression 'corps du Christ,' précisément en tant que société, et que société óu l'unité dont le principe est spirituel s'affirme dans la visibilite même de l'organisme social." *Ibid.*, 329.

[72] "Ex voluntate Christi, coniunctio cum corpore Ecclesiae omnibus hominibus ad salutem consequendam 1) est necessaria, 2) necessitate medii, 3) in re vel in voto." F. X. Calcagno, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Naples 1948) 166.

3. SUMMARY

Although the necessity of the Church was not its direct concern, nevertheless, the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* authoritatively eliminated several concepts heretofore used in explaining that doctrine. It did this by expressing a very clear and definite theology of the nature of the Church. Thus the Mystical Body and the Roman Catholic Church are identical; the importance of the visible aspect of the Church is not to be minimized; all salvation is caused by the visible Church; there is a sharp distinction between membership and being related to the Church in desire, though in a given case either could suffice for salvation. These principles invalidated any reference to a large or invisible Church as well as any over-emphasis of the invisible spiritual reality of the Church; they confirmed the rejection of the body-soul explanation of the Church's necessity. With the benefit of such clear and authoritative teaching we would expect uniformity among the post-encyclical writings. Such was not the case.

Not all theologians accepted the above views as the genuine teaching of the encyclical. This was particularly true in regard to the concept of membership in the Church and the Mystical Body. Many theologians had conceived membership in the Mystical Body as a participation in the life of Christ; therefore they interpreted the encyclical as favoring that view. This was of great importance to the doctrine of the necessity of the Church; for from the time of the encyclical, this doctrine has become inextricably involved with the question of membership; at least in a negative way. It is true the concept of membership has not often been the starting point of an explanation of the Church's necessity; but the exposition of the doctrine *De membris* ecclesiae has often been filled with conclusions of grave consequences for this doctrine. When the theologians began to interpret incorrectly the text of Pius XII; when they began defending a pneumatological concept of membership, they were sapping the very vitality of the doctrine of the Church's necessity.

The distinctions used to interpret that text were varied. McGuiness insisted that only culpable separation from the Church deprived a man of membership in the Mystical Body. Therefore the two were not co-extensive; a man could be a member of one and not the other. The body-soul distinction is thus re-asserted. Carrigan distinguished between ordinary and extra-ordinary members of the Church. The consequence is an extension of the concept of Church; the Church which is necessary for salvation is no longer the Roman Catholic Church. Morel distinguished between member in the simple sense and in the eminent sense; this leads to the positing of two societies of un-equal extension: the Mystical Body and the Church. A non-Catholic could be saved by membership in the Mystical Body; this would give rise to an ontological relation to the Church. The causal necessity of the Roman Catholic Church is implicitly denied and the doctrine of the Church's necessity is interpreted as applying only to formal heretics and schismatics. Liegé accepts Pius XII's identification of the Mystical Body and the Church. However his qualified use of the term member to describe those non-Catholics who are in the state of grace seems to broaden the words of the encyclical.

The text concerning members was not the only section of the encyclical to be interpreted in various ways. Chavasse accepted the concept of member; but understood the encyclical to say there was an ontological relation to the Church on the part of all the separated; in so doing he set aside the traditional concept of the implicit *votum;* applied to the necessity of the Church, his views would leave that doctrine without meaning.

There were in addition many commentators who like Tromp and Bouyer understood the encyclical to identify the Mystical Body and the visible Church. Strangely then, instead of inaugurating a period of great clarity in regard to the doctrine, the encyclical was followed by a period of considerable confusion, at least in the area of periodical writings which often returned to the very orientations the encyclical sought to set aside. However the school theologians continued their presentation of the *in re-in voto* explanation; this continuing trend is exemplified by Parente, Philip and Calcagno though the latter incorporates conflicting elements.

Some authors made no reference to the encyclical, but set forth concepts not in harmony with its teaching. Dumont conceived of membership as a sharing in the life of Christ; as a result there were two societies of unequal extension; one visible the other invisible. Union with the Church was a result of union with Christ in grace. Michalon saw the Church including all humanity. Hasseveldt repeated the view of Adam and Congar concerning the efficacy of "catholic things" present in non-Catholic religions. On this point it is of significance to note that Liegé asserted that these elements could receive efficacy only from the personal disposition, the *votum,* of the individual. In themselves they were ineffective.

Truly the encyclical's use of *ordinentur* was a shift in terminology from the earlier *pertinere ad Ecclesiam* commonly used by the theologians. The first attempts to explain the meaning of this change had harmful effects upon the doctrine of the Church's necessity, often directing it back to a position theologians had already abandoned. In focusing attention of this change in terms, the authors did not always preserve the teaching of the encyclical as a whole regarding the nature of the Church and man's union with it.

This reaction to the encyclical, plus the tendency of Ecumenism to distinguish between the Church and the Mystical Body, combined to make this a period wherein the necessity of the Church was not receiving, especially on the popular level, the accurate and meaningful exposition developed by theologians from the time of the Vatican Council.

CHAPTER X

The Doctrine in Recent Theology

The encyclical *Mystici Corporis* did not succeed in bringing an increased clarity to the general exposition of the Church's necessity. In the expanded theological activity which followed the encyclical, there were many concepts of the Church and man's unity with it which re-introduced confusing and misleading elements into the explanation of this doctrine. This confusion derived from the manifold distinctions made by theologians in interpreting three areas of the encyclical's teaching: the concept of membership, the extension of the Church and the Mystical Body, and the significance of the word *ordinentur* used to describe the union of some men with the Church. Such a situation could not long endure. In August of 1950, the magnificent encyclical *Humani Generis* was issued. Later in the fall of 1952, His Excellency the Archbishop of Boston published a letter sent him by the Holy Office. This letter actually pre-dated the encyclical. Although it was published in 1952, it is dated August 8, 1949. Therein is given the most complete explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity ever to appear to a magisterial document. The teaching of these two documents provides a criterion for evaluating the interpretations of theologians.

1. HUMANI GENERIS

Its profundity, its timeliness, its firm yet considerate tone have all combined to make *Humani Generis* the wonder of the theological world. In the years since its appearance, it has received exhaustive commentary by the theologians.[1] It is neither necessary nor possible to present here a complete commentary of the whole encyclical; only the sections relating to the Church's necessity are of interest. In a brief catalogue of errors which "have already borne their deadly fruit in almost all branches of theology," the Holy Father complains that: "Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation."[2] There is no further elaboration, but it would seem that the Holy Father regards these two errors as connected so that "meaningless formula" would, sometimes at least, involve incorrect notions concerning the identity of the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body. By dissociating these two concepts, the former is easily made to appear as something inconsequential. This was illustrated in the last chapter where it was also shown that the basis for such a distinction was often a qualified acceptance of the encyclical's teaching concerning membership. In insisting upon the identity of the Church and the Mystical Body, the encyclical Humani Generis would seem to be reproving also, at least indirectly, those qualifications of membership which provide the foundation for denying that identity.

---

[1] For a rather large bibliography of commentaries on this encyclical, see "Commentaries on Humani Generis," by G. Weigel, *TS* 12 (1951) 520-549.

The statement that some are reducing the necessity of pertaining (although the English translation has "belonging," the Latin text reads *"necessitas pertinendi ad veram Ecclesiam"*) to the true Church to a meaningless formula carries a particular emphasis. It does not reprove authors for denying or ignoring the doctrine but for emptying it of meaning. Beside distinguishing between the Church and the Mystical Body, and exposing an inaccurate concept of membership, there are several additional ways in which this may be done.

First an author may separate community from society or institute of salvation from community of salvation, thus leaving little urgency in the necessity of union with the Roman Catholic Church. Secondly, an author may over-value the "catholic elements" present in non-Catholic religions, considering them means of salvation in themselves. This would effectively reduce the doctrine to a meaningless formula, since there would be no urgent necessity for union with the Roman Catholic Church. This error would seem to come under the encyclical's condemnation of an "imprudent eirenism" which considers "as an obstacle to the restoration of fraternal union, things founded on the laws and principles given by Christ and likewise on institutions founded by Him. . . ."[3] Thirdly, an author may simply state that all those possessing grace may be saved, without referring to the visible Church. Many of the explanations adversely criticized in earlier chapters are thus officially reproved. Among them we can place all those explanations which do not explicitly demand *as a necessary pre-requisite for salvation, some union with the Roman Catholic Church.* Finally an author may explain the doctrine in a way that is incompatible with the statement of this truth in the documents of the Church's magisterium. Those documents have required that a person be "within" the Church in some way in order to be saved. They have consistently required this union but have described it only in a general way. Theologians have described it as a union in desire, based upon supernatural faith and charity. This is the *votum ecclesiae* which has been described in detail for the first time in an official document, in the Holy Office Letter mentioned above.

---

[2] *AAS,* 42, 571, Eng. tr.: *Humani Generis* (Washington: N.C.W.C., 1950) 12.

2. HOLY OFFICE LETTER

This letter was occasioned by a false interpretation of the Church's necessity which was being proposed by a group of people associated with "St. Benedict's Center," in Boston. It was their contention that at least an explicit desire was necessary in the case of people who are not members of the Church.[4] The foregoing chapters show how incredible it is that any serious examination of this doctrine could culminate in such a distortion. To rectify this situation, the Holy Office on August 8, 1949, sent to the Archbishop of Boston a letter which has come to be known by its opening words: "Suprema haec sacra. . . ." Not only did the letter brand as erroneous the explanation being advanced by the group, but it entered into a full explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity. The importance of this official explanation of the doctrine will be lost upon no one. So clear are the words of the letter that they are their own best commentary. We will reproduce the principal doctrinal portions of the letter. After several introductory paragraphs the letter states:

---

[3] *Ibid.*, 565. Eng. tr. 6.

[4] See Raymond Karam, "Reply to a Liberal," in *From the Housetops,* 3 3 61. As quoted by J. C. Fenton in "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation," *AER* 124 (1951) 141.

> Now, in the first place, the Church teaches that in this matter there is question of a most strict command of Jesus Christ. For he explicitly enjoined on His Apostles to teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever He Himself had commanded (Matt. 28:19-20).
>
> Now, among the commandments of Christ, that one holds not the least place, by which we are commanded to be incorporated by Baptism into the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, and to remain united to Christ and to His Vicar, through whom He Himself in an invisible manner governs the Church on earth.
>
> Therefore, no one will be saved who, knowing the Church to have been divinely established by Christ, nevertheless refuses to submit to the Church or withholds obedience from the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth.
>
> Not only did the Savior command that all nations should enter the Church, but He also decreed the Church to be a means of salvation without which no one can enter the kingdom of eternal glory.
>
> In His infinite mercy God has willed that the effects, necessary for one to be saved, of those helps to salvation which are directed towards man's final end, not by intrinsic necessity, but only by divine institution, can also be obtained in certain circumstances when those helps are used only in *desire* and *longing*. This we see clearly stated in the Sacred Council of Trent, both in reference to the Sacrament of Regeneration and in reference to the Sacrament of Penance (Denziger, nn. 797, 807).
>
> The same in its own degree must be asserted of the Church, in as far as she is the general help to salvation. Therefore, that one may obtain eternal salvation, it is not always required that he be incorporated into the Church *actually* as a member, but it is necessary that at least he be united to her by *desire* and *longing*.

> However this desire need not always be explicit, as it is in catechumens; but when a person is involved in invincible ignorance, God accepts also an implicit desire, so called because it is included in that good disposition of soul, whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God.

The letter states that the above is clearly the doctrine exposed in the encyclical letter *Mystici Corporis,* in the two sections referred to so often in the last chapter. It then continues, explaining the nature of this desire:

> But it must not be thought that any kind of a desire of entering the Church suffices that one may be saved. It is necessary that the desire by which one is related to the Church be animated by perfect charity. Nor can an implicit desire produce its effect unless a person has supernatural faith: "for he who comes to God must believe that God exists and is a rewarder of those who seek Him" (Hebrews, 11:6). The Council of Trent declares (Session VI, chap. 8): "Faith is the beginning of man's salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God and attain to the fellowship of His children" (Denziger, n. 801).[5]

Official approval is thus given to several concepts traditionally used by the theologians.

1. The Church is necessary both with the necessity of precept and of means. There can be conditions which excuse from the first, as with every precept. But there is no possible relaxation of the second necessity since the Church is a "means of salvation, without which no one can enter the kingdom of eternal glory."
2. Actual membership in the Church is not always necessary but it is absolutely necessary for every man that "at least he be united to her by desire and longing."
3. This desire need not always be explicit but may be implicit. However not every kind of desire suffices; it must be animated

---

[5] Official English translation as given in *AER,* 127 (1952) 311-315. The Latin text is printed in the same issue.

by perfect charity and founded upon supernatural faith. No mere velleity suffices; there must be a real act of the will.[6]

4. In establishing the sufficiency of this implicit desire in certain cases, the letter confines use of the term "member" to describe those who fulfill the conditions established in the encyclical. Those who are united to the Church only by desire are referred to in a manner which is important to note: *"saltem requiritur, ut eidem voto ac desiderio adhaereat."* Later in the letter when this *votum* is referred to, a different expression is used: *"Requiritur enim ut votum quo quis ad Ecclesiam ordinetur, perfecta caritate informetur. . . ."* Thus *adhaereat* and *ordinetur* are used to describe the same union with the Church, thus indicating that perhaps too much significance has been attached to the use of the word *ordinentur* by the Holy Father in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis,* as if this latter signaled a new precision and orientation which the Pontiff desired to bring to this question.

For the third time within ten years, an official document deals with the doctrine of the Church's necessity. The encyclical *Mystici Corporis* identified that reality with the visible Roman Catholic Church, defined membership and upheld the sufficiency of the *votum implicitum. Humani Generis* insisted upon the co-extension of the Mystical Body and the Church and complained that some explanations were removing all meaning from the doctrine of the Church's necessity. The Holy Office letter, in giving a full explanation of this doctrine, describes the minimal degree of salvific union with the Church as a union based upon supernatural faith and charity.

Since the appearance of these three documents, the doctrine of the Church's necessity has entered into what may be called its final phase. Theologians now rarely consider the doctrine directly. Their efforts have narrowed to the consideration of the manifold ways in which a man may be united to the Church; the question of terminology has assumed prime importance. Often there is no explicit mention of the Church's necessity, yet it is always against the background of this doctrine that the question is treated.

---

[6] See J. C. Fenton, "The Holy Office Letter on the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER* 127 (1952) 456-457.

Theologians have continued to read distinctions into the two "classic" texts of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*. The distinctions are even more numerous than before. The most common foundation for these distinctions is the conviction that possession of sanctifying grace by a non-Catholic bestows upon him real membership in the Mystical Body and hence in the Church. It is then in the question *De membris ecclesiae* that we shall find, for the most part, the current theology of the Church's necessity for salvation.

3. THEOLOGIANS

In March of 1950, H. Holstein wrote in *Année théologique* on the subject *"Le Christ, tête de tous les hommes."* He quotes the words of *Mystici Corporis* describing those who have a "certain relationship" to the Church and asserts that before we set out to determine whether and how this ordination is realized in all the separated we should "determine with precision the foundation of this ordination and give precision to its exact nature."[7] However we must be careful not to exaggerate the meaning of the text and speak of *members* of the Church, or *belonging* to the Mystical Body when it is merely a question of *ordination* and *attachment*. To indulge in the former terms is merely to return to the body-soul distinction.[8] Holstein thinks that, when attempting to develop the exact nature of this ordination, some are necessarily brought to an impasse by their methodology. On the one hand they place the Church in her extension: on the other, the non-Catholic in good faith and invincible ignorance. An attempt is made to find an affinity between the two. This is impossible since it necessitates positing either an invisible prolongation of the Church or the presence of a desire of baptism in the mere good faith of the heretic or infidel. Neither of these assumptions is valid.[9]

The problem is to be approached in a different way. Since there is often no conscious orientation of the dissident toward

---

[7] "Il faut déterminer avec précision le fondement de cette ordination et à en préciser la nature exact." H. Holstein, "Le Christ tête de tous les hommes," *Année théologique,* 11 (1950) 22.

[8] *Ibid.,* 23.

[9] *Ibid.,* 25.

Baptism, we must seek out the ontological nature and foundation of the "unconscious desire" spoken of in the encyclical. Holstein discovers that foundation in the Thomistic doctrine of Christ as the head of the whole human race:

> We think that it is important to reverse the perspectives and to consider first of all not the man of good will . . . but He who, unknown to that man, draws him to His Church, because He has already incorporated him: Christ the head of the Church. If there exists in the well-disposed infidel and heretic this unconscious desire of which the encyclical speaks, which right now orients these people to the Mystical Body, it is because they are already, in a certain real, indisputable fashion, members of Christ, because Christ is already their Head. It is not they who attach themselves to the Church, it is not even the Church, inasmuch as it is the assembly of the sons of God, which exercise a salutary attraction upon them, it is Christ who, in the mysterious dimensions of His ecclesiastical redemption, "contains" and incorporates them.[10]

This is the approach to St. Thomas;[11] it is the approach of the encyclical: "The perspective of St. Thomas is exactly that of the pontifical text which we have mentioned. In neither place is there question of the eternal salvation of the infidel . . . but of the present situation of non-Catholics."[12] So for Holstein the "unconscious desire and yearning" of the encyclical is equivalent to the *sunt de ecclesia in potentia* of St. Thomas. Thus independently of any personal dispositions, these men of good faith are ordained to the Church: this is precisely the view of the Holy Fathers:

---

[10] "Nous pensons qu'il importe de renverser les perspectives et de considérer d'abord, non pas l'homme de bonne volunté . . . mais celui qui à son insu, l'attire à son Eglise, parce que déjà il se l'est incorporé: le Christ, tête de l'Eglise. S'il existe, chez l'infidèle et l'hérétique bien disposés, ce voeu inconscient dont parle l'encyclique, qui les oriente présentement au Corps Mystique, c'est parce que, déjà d'une certaine façon réele et indiscutable, ils sont membres du Christ, parce que déjà le Christ est leur tête. Ce ne sont pas eux qui se rattachèrent à l'Eglise, ce n'est même pas l'Eglise en tant que réunion des fils de Dieu qui exerce sur eux une salutaire attraction, c'est le Christ qui dans les mystérieuses dimensions de sa rédemption ecclésiale, les 'continet,' et les incorpore." *Loc. cit.*

[11] Holstein cites: III q. 8, a. 3.

[12] La perspective où se place St. Thomas est exactement celle où se situe le texts pontifical que nous avons souligné: il ne s'agit pas, ici et là, du salut éternal de l'infidèle . . . mais de la situation présente du non-catholique." *Ibid.*, 27.

> If the infidel belongs potentially to the Church, it is in virtue of the action of capital grace, and it is this same capital grace which tends to make of him, from a member "in potency," a member "in act" of the Church, the body of Christ; that is, it leads him to baptism and the communion of faith informed by charity. From the same grace comes this "motion," this interior "instinct," thanks to which the infidel of good faith is disposed to perceive miracles, evidence, or preaching as divine signs, and adhere to them by faith. He is not yet conscious of this aptitude which is the gift of God in him; he grows up a complete stranger to the Church, and nevertheless, there is in him, unknown to him, a kind of inclination, a desire and a yearning for completion which betrays in his soul the mysterious working of the capital grace of Christ: etiamsi inscio quodam desiderio ac voto ad mysticum Redemptoris corpus ordinentur. . . .[13]

Is it possible, however, to equate the teaching of the encyclical with the teaching of St. Thomas? The ordination of which the encyclical speaks is a fulfillment of the necessity of salvific union with the Church: the potential attachment of all men is not. To identify these two relations is to predicate of all men that union with the Church which is necessary for salvation. Furthermore

---

[13] "Si l'infidèle appartient potentiellement à l'Eglise, c'est en vertu de l'agir de la grâce capitale, et c'est la même grâce capitale qui tend à le faire devenir de membrè en puissance,' membre 'en acte' de l'Eglise corps du Christ, c'est-à-dire à l'acheminer au baptême et à la communion de la foi informée par la charité. D'où cette 'motion,' cet 'instinct intérieur,' grâce auquel l'infidèle de bonne volonté est apte à percevoir comme signe divine le miracle, le témoignage ou la prédication, et à y adhérer par la foi. Il n'a pas encore concience de cette aptitude, que est en lui don de Dieu, il crôit encore totalement étranger à l'Eglise, et, cependent, il ya en lui, à son insu, comme un attrait, un désir et un voeu de plénitude qui trahit en son âme le travail mystérieux de la grâce capitale du Christ: etiamsi inscio quodam desiderio ac voto ad mysticum Redemptoris corpus ordinentur. . . ." *Ibid.,* 30.

Holstein is refining a bit the teaching of St. Thomas. St. Thomas predicates the potency of the whole human race, while Holstein predicates it only of those who are in good faith. He truly succeeds in establishing an attachment to the Church, but that attachment is not based upon personal dispositions and so is not the traditional *votum ecclesiae*. Holstein's rejection of the "old way" of posing the problem takes no account of the traditional concept of an implicit *votum*. Like Chavasse he fastens upon the word "unconscious" used by the encyclical; to him this can be explained only by some ontological relation independent of any personal dispositions. If this were taken as the meaning of the encyclical text, that text would be removing all meaning from the necessity of union with the Church.

Holstein returns to this question in the same year in *Etudes*. He is concerned with the relation of men of good faith to the Church. That relation cannot be called membership, as Mersch has done[14] nor can such men *belong* invisibly to the Church as Liégé has stated. His objection to Mersch's terminology is clear; but his objection to Liégé is more subtle and he devotes himself to it at greater length. The basis of his objection is centered upon the word *appartenance* which Liégé uses; Holstein prefers *rattachement*. The nuance is observed by the text of the encyclical:

> The word has not been lightly chosen "they are ordained (ordinentur) to the Mystical Body." It is not a matter then of belonging, since the Holy Father states that only those who fulfill the three conditions traditionally established since the time of St. Augustine can, in the proper sense, belong to the Church, the body of Christ. These conditions are: baptism, the profession of the Catholic faith and communion with the Church. Nevertheless not every bond is severed between these men of good will and the Church: an unconscious desire and yearning attaches them to the Mystical Body, or better still, ordains them to it. The Pope has not said that the infidel or the heretic in good faith is a member of the Church; his formula takes cognizance both of the estrangement wherein the "separated" finds himself effectively "outside" the true Church, the body of Christ,

---

[14] See Mersch, *Théologie du corps mystique*, 2.195-196.

> and the bond which nevertheless attaches him to it without his knowledge.[15]

In explaining the foundation of this ordination, Holstein proposes again the doctrine of St. Thomas recounted in the previous article; this is the only view which can explain and make possible the relation of which the encyclical speaks:

> Only this mysterious activity which makes Christ the center of attraction of every man and ordains him to this Church "which is His Body" explains and makes possible "the unconscious desire and yearning" of which Pius XII speaks. It is an unconscious desire because the dissident is not aware of the capital influence which, without his knowledge, draws him and tends to incorporate him fully by baptism into the Church, the Mystical Body.[16]

By not making it clear that personal dispositions must actuate, at least to some degree, this potential dependence of all men on Christ, Holstein reduces the encyclical's "unconscious desire" to "something found in practically all non-members of the Church apart from any real steps or efforts on their part towards the Church and away from religious conditions or societies opposed to it."[17] Holstein uses the term member only in the strict sense, reserving it for those people who fulfill the conditions mentioned in the encyclical. Equally strict is his use of the term *belong;* he equates this with membership.

---

[15] "Le verbe n'a pas été choisi au hasard 'ils sont ordonnés (ordinentur) au Corps mystique.' Il ne s'agit pas donc d'appartenance, puisque, le Pape le rappelle, ne peuvent appartenir, au sens propre, à l'Eglise corps du Christ que ceux qui remplissent les trois conditions traditionnellement fixées depuis Saint Augustin: bâpteme, profession de foi catholique, communion avec l'Eglise. Et cependent tout lien n'est pas coupé entre ces hommes de bonne volonté et l'Eglise: un désir et voeu inconscient les rattache au Corps mystique mieux encore les ordonne à lui. Le Pape n'est dit pas que l'infidèle ou l'hérétique de bonne foi sont membres de l'Eglise; sa formule respecte à la fois l'éloignement où se trouve le 'separé,' effectivement 'en dehors' de la véritable Eglise Corps du Christ et le lien qui cependant l'y rattache à son insu." *Ibid.,* 248-249.

[16] "Seul cet agir mystérieux qui fait du Christ le centre d'attraction de tout homme et l'ordonne à cette Eglise 'qui est son corps' explique et rend possible 'le désir et voeu inconscient' dont parle Pie XII. Voeu inconscient parce que le séparé ne se rend pas compte de l'influx capital, qui, à son insu, le sollicite et tend à l'agréger pleinement à l'Eglise corps mystique par le baptême." *Ibid.,* 251.

In 1950 both Denis[18] and Salaverri[19] use the *in re-in voto* explanation. For the latter, necessity of means refers to that which is either a positive cause of salvation, or a *conditio sine qua non.* It is subdivided into that which is absolutely necessary (*in re*) and that which is disjunctively necessary (*in re aut in voto*). Describing this latter, he writes: "A means necessary *in re* or *in voto* is one which can be supplied for, whenever real use is impossible, by a substitute (for example, charity or martyrdom) which is accompanied by a resolution to use the means itself."[20] It is in this last way that the Church can be considered a necessary means of salvation. In 1951 Dallavale reduces the doctrine to two statements: "Whoever is 'culpably' outside the Church cannot be saved. . . . Whoever is 'inculpably outside the Church can be saved."[21] In explanation of the second statement he writes: "They can be saved because no one is condemned except through his own fault. Although they have not actually received baptism of water, they are saved through baptism of desire, which is implicitly contained in that state of soul whereby they would be disposed to receive it whenever they knew it was God's will."[22] This can also be classified as the *in re-in voto* explanation but the arrangement of matter is poor and the necessity of union with the Church is not clearly expressed.

---

[17] Fenton, "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation," *AER,* 124 (1951) 204.

[18] See L. Denis, *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae* (Braine-le-Comte 1950) 214.

[19] M. Nicolau-J. Salaverri, *Sacrae theologiae summa.* I. *Theologia fundamentalis* (3 ed. Madrid 1955) 889.

[20] "Necessarium vel in re vel in voto est illud medium quod, cum in re haberi nequit, suppleri potest re vicaria (puta, caritate vel martyrio) coniuncta cum voluntate adhibendi medium." *Ibid.,* 890.

[21] "Chi 'colpevolmente' è fuori della Chiesa de per se non si salva." . . . "Chi 'incolpevolmente' è fuori della Chiesa puo salvarsi." N. Dallavale, *La Chiesa* (Parma 1951) 114.

[22] "Costoro possone salvarsi perchè nessuno si danna se non per propria colpa. Essi pur non avendo di fatto ricevuto il battesimo di acqua, si salvano in forza del battesimo di desiderio, che è contenuto implicitamente in quello stato d'animo per cui sarebbero disposti a riceverlo qualora lo sapessero da Dio voluto." *Loc. cit.*

In the second volume of his extensive work *The Church of the Word Incarnate,* Journet examines the nature of the body of the Church. He devotes one section to a consideration of the members of Christ and the Church. It is in two parts; first, "Who is a member of the Church?" Secondly, "Outside the Church no salvation." Explaining the notion of membership he writes that: ". . . he is a member of the Church in whom the created soul of Christ is present."[23] This created soul is a full Christological grace flowing from the head to the body: "It includes three indispensable elements through which it can be designated: sacramental character, sacramental grace, and jurisdictional orientation. Ultimately and formally, it consists in sacramental and oriented grace."[24]

Since these elements of the created soul are subject to partial realization, the notion of membership can be subdivided: "Thus the notion of member of the Church admits of degrees. It is not a univocal notion. It is an analogous and proportional notion, susceptible of being realized in different degrees."[25] Journet then proceeds to distinguish member in act, member in potency, and a whole galaxy of modes of belonging to the Church, depending on how, and to what degree the elements of the created soul are realized. Among these he lists *l'appartenance tendencielle de charité* which corresponds to the *votum ecclesiae.* All the other degrees of belonging to the Church, whether based on faith (*formata aut informata*) alone or faith and baptism, are described by the one term *appartenance.* Journet does not always consider these degrees of belonging vis-a-vis salvation; rather he accentuates one or another of the dominant characteristics of this manifold belonging, v.g. visibility, sacramentality, degree of actuality.

---

[23] ". . . celui-là est membre de l'Eglise en qui l'âme créée de l'Eglise est présente." C. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné 2* (Paris 1951) 1058.

[24] "Elle comporte indispensablement trois éléments par lesquels on peut la désigner: le caractère sacramentel, la grâce sacramentelle, l'orientation juridictionnelle. Ultimement, formellement, elle consiste dans la grâce sacramentelle et orientée." *Loc. cit.*

[25] "Ainsi la notion de membre de l'Eglise admet des degrés. Ce n'est pas une notion univoque. C'est une notion analogique et proportionnelle, susceptible de se réaliser à des étages différents." *Loc. cit.*

In the question of membership, Journet proceeds philosophically, his point of origin being the Thomistic concept of the Church; necessarily then he includes the possession of grace in the concept of membership, not sufficiently observing the clear departure made from this view by Pius XII in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis.* His myriad degrees of belonging to the Church are considered degrees of membership. The question of membership, however, is primary theological, not philosophical;[26] theologically it is an indivisible whole. Journet's "various degrees of membership" is without strong theological foundation. Finally, his concept of the created soul of the Church has been rejected by some as of little use in this matter.[27] It must be noted that amid all the degrees of belonging to the Church, Journet does set apart that belonging which is based on charity and is thus salvific.

Coming to the question of the Church's necessity, Journet cites the scriptural and patristic evidence, emphasizing the frequent application of this axiom to those who *refuse* to enter the Church. He then lists the magisterial texts, turning finally to "The Elements of the Theological Synthesis." His first concern is to determine precisely what the Church is. Christ is the only source of salvation in the world. Those who gather around Christ are the habitation of the Trinity among men and this is the Church. Such a sublime and supernatural community must be the result of a wondrous grace. This grace was given by Christ before he returned to Heaven:

> Before returning to heaven, Christ instituted here below sacramental and jurisdictional powers, under cover of which he will continue to reach men. They are the hands and the sensible voice of Christ across time and space. The grace, fully Christian and Christ-forming which comes to us through them, can henceforth be called sacramental and oriented grace (*grace sacramentelle et orientée*). This is the created, inherent soul of the

---

[26] T. Zapelena, S.J., "De actuali statu ecclesiologiae," *Analecta Gregoriana,* 68 Series fac. Theol., Sectio A, n. 11 (Rome 1954) 149.

[27] Th. Strotmann, "Les membres de l'Eglise," *Irénikon,* 25 (1952) 261.

> Church, which fashions for it a body and radiates throughout this body.[28]

This contact of Christ with humanity constitutes the Church *en acte achevé*. It makes of the Church a center to which are drawn all men: "In the order of salvation, pressed around Christ who favors it with his contact, it [the Church] is the point of condensation of an immense nebula, the solid nucleus, which, through growth, attracts, sustains, draws in its wake, more or less closely, the billions of men scattered like atoms across space and time."[29] This then is the concept of Church which it is necessary to have in order to understand the axiom "Outside the Church no salvation."

Journet next considers how sinners can be members of the Church and then turns to the modes of union with Christ viewed from a temporal standpoint. Before the coming of Christ all men were given grace that was Christian by anticipation, since all grace was given in view of the coming of Christ. In a certain sense then the Church already existed and the salvation of men effected a certain belonging to the Church which would one day be established by Christ: "The normal regime of humanity is a regime of latent and tendential belonging to the future Christ and to his Church."[30]

After the coming of Christ this normal regime was changed. All graces are still derived from Christ; but this derivation can occur in two ways: "Just as Christ cured bodies both by contact and from a distance, so he saves souls by acting upon them either by contact or from a distance."[31] The former activity is effected through the visible hierarchy; the latter by interior illumination. Since the time of Christ's actual coming however, the normal regime is the "regime of contact-graces, which gives rise to the Church *en acte achevé*."[32] However the devil has worked much harm and the victims of schisms, heresy, not to mention those still inculpably in paganism, are removed from any participation in this normal regime. But God wills the salvation of all men and where his activity *par contact* is not possible; he is still able to reach all men by his activity *à distance* which knows no obstacles. This activity *à distance* becomes a supplement for the normal regime; it is no longer merely a preparation for the action of the hierarchy, but it is a veritable substitute for it: "It [activity *à distance*] then assumes, beyond its *proper and normal* role, which is preparing men to receive the action of the hierarchy and conserving the effects of this action, an *abnormal and supplementary* role, which is to communicate the graces necessary for salvation to those whom the contact-graces do not affect, or whom they affect only incompletely."[33] Graces received in this manner effect only a latent, initial, tendential union with the Church: "The action of Christ *à distance,* even in its supplementary function, can communicate a grace that is only imperfectly Christian and Christ forming: it causes a belonging to the Church only in latent, initial and tendential act."[34] The normal function of this grace is to prepare men for the grace of contact; where this is unattainable it can supply for that grace, thus making salvation possible through a belonging to the Church *en acte tendenciel.* This was the normal regime for the Old Testament; now, though still productive of salvation it remains an abnormal regime:

---

[28] "Avant de remonter au ciel, le Christ institue ici-bas les pourvoirs sacramentels et juridictionnels, sous l'envoloppe desquels il continuera de toucher les hommes. Ils sont comme les mains et la voix sensible du Christ à travers le temps et l'espace. La grâce pleinement christique et christo-conformante, qui nous arrive à travers eux, pourra donc désormais s'appeler la grâce sacramentelle et orientée. Voilà l'âme créée et inhérente de l'Eglise, qui lui façonne son corps et transparait au travers de ce corps." Journet, *op. cit.,* 1102.

[29] "Dans l'ordre du salut, serrée autour du Christ qui la favorise de son contact, elle est le point de condensation d'une immense nébuleuse, le noyau solide qui, par surcroît, attire, soutient, entraîne dans son sillage, de plus ou moins près, des milliards d'hommes répandus comme des atomes à travers l'espace et le temps." *Loc. cit.*

[30] "Le régime normal de l'humanité est alors un régime d'appartenance latente et tendencielle au Christ futur et à son Eglise." *Ibid.,* 1107.

---

[31] "De même que le Christ a guéri les corps tantôt par contact et tantôt à distance, il sauve les âmes en agissant soit par son contact, soit à distance." *Ibid.,* 1110.

[32] ". . . le régime des grâces de contact, qui suscite l'Eglise en acte achèvé." *Loc. cit.*

[33] "Elle assume alors, outre son rôle *propre et normal,* qui est de préparer à recevoir l'action hiérarchique et d'en conserver les effets, un rôle *anormal et supplétif,* qui est de communiquer, à ceux que les grâces de contact n'atteignent pas ou n'atteignent qu'incomplètement, les grâces de salut qui leur sont nécessaires." *Ibid.,* 1112-1113.

[34] "L'action du Christ *à distance* ne peut communiquer, même dans sa fonction supplétive, qu'une grâce imparfaitement christique et christo-conformante: elle ne fait apparaître l'Eglise qu'en acte latent, initial, tendanciel." *Ibid.,* 1113.

> But abnormally, wherever the contact graces cannot reach, the graces *à distance* have the function of supplying for them, in as much as they can, in bringing at least to each soul, the divine aids without which it cannot be saved. This substitution is always something inferior. It is incapable . . . of giving rise to the Church *en acte manifeste et achevé*: it only forms the Church *en acte latent, initial, tendenciel.*[35]

Thus the two regimes of salvation rise from two distinct graces; one received through the normal hierarchical ministry which is the normal dispensation; the other received through the internal illumination of the individual by Christ and this remains the abnormal dispensation. The former constitutes the Church *en acte achevé,* the latter, the Church *en acte tendenciel.* This constitutes Journet's theological synthesis which he summarizes thus:

> So the Church, the Church of Christ entrusted to Peter, is at the same time more pure and more extensive than we realize. It is more pure because it is without sin, though not without sinners, and the faults of its members never deface it. It is more extensive, because it gathers about itself everything that is saved in the world. It knows that, from the depths of space and of time, there are attached to it by desire, in an initial and hidden way, millions of men who are prevented by invincible ignorance from knowing it, but who have not refused, in the midst of the errors in which they live, the grace of living faith which, in the secret of their hearts, God who wills that all men should be saved and should come to the knowledge of the truth, offers to

---

[35] "Mais anormalement, là où les grâces de contact ne peuvent parvenir, les grâces à distance ont la fonction de les suppléer, dans la mesure où elles le peuvent, en portant au moins à chaque âme les secours divins sans lesquels elle ne pourrait être sauvée. Cette suppléance est toujours un pis aller. Elle est incapable . . . de susciter l'Eglise en acte manifeste et achevé; elle ne le forme qu'en acte latent, initial, tendanciel." *Ibid.,* 1114.

> them. [The Church] itself does not know them by name, but it feels their innumerable presence around itself and sometimes, amidst the silences of prayer, it hears in the night the confused sound of their walking.[36]

Journet's theological synthesis labors under three difficulties. First, it views the salvation of those outside the Church's area of influence as the direct work of Christ whose labors are thus a substitute for the activity of the Church which in such cases is ineffective. Grace *per contact* is effected in the Church and through the Church; grace *à distance* is effected immediately by Christ; it is a substitution for the former. In such an explanation the universal causal role of the Church is not safeguarded; tendential, initial union with the Church is the result of salvation; not a necessary prerequisite. Secondly the very concept of the Church fares rather badly here, as its extension is widened. As has been observed in this regard; the Church's extension is not dilated by the people who are united to it in desire.[37] Thirdly it is difficult to understand how the just of the Old Testament can be described as belonging to the Church initially. Zapelena has commented that this would constitute a desire objectively impossible to realize.[38] Since the necessity of the Church dates only from the time of the promulgation of the gospel, it seems unnecessary to attempt to predicate a *votum ecclesiae* of the just of the Old Testament.

---

[36] "Ainsi, l'Eglise, l'Eglise du Christ confiée à Pierre, est à la fois plus pure et plus vaste que nous ne savons. Plus pure, puisqu'elle est, non certes sans pécheurs, mais sans péché, et que les fautes de ses membres ne la souillent pas. Plus vaste, puisqu'elle rassemble autour d'elle tout ce qui dans le monde est sauvé. Elle sait que, du fond, de l'espace et du temps se rattachent à elle par le désir, d'une manière initiale et latente, des millions d'hommes qu'une ignorance invincible empêche de la connaître, mais qui n'ont pas refusé, au sein des erreurs où ils vivent, la grâce de la foi vive que leur offre, dans le secret du coeur, le Dieu qui veut que tous les hommes soient sauvés et viennent à la connaissance de la vérité. Elle-même ne les connaît pas non plus nommément, mais elle sent autour d'elle leur presence innombrable, et parfois, entre les silences de sa prière, elle entend monter dans la nuit la rumeur confuse de leur marche." *Loc. cit.*

[37] J. C. Fenton, "Father Journet's Concept of Church," *AER,* 127 (1952) 379-380.

[38] T. Zapelena, "De actuali statu ecclesiologiae," p. 162.

There would seem then to be fundamental weaknesses in Journet's approach; under the multiple distinctions made, sufficient cognizance is not taken of the diverse orientation given the question of membership by Pius XII. There is also some damage done to the necessary role of the visible Church in the process of every man's salvation.

In 1951, J. C. Fenton authored another long three-part article in *AER* entitled "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation."[39] The first section is a detailed examination of the exposition of this doctrine by some modern theologians. The second lists seven faulty types of explanations which can be found among the theologians.[40] Then by examining the treatment of this doctrine by the older theologians (Melchior Cano, St. Robert Bellarmine, Francis Sylvius, Francis Suarez, Alphonsus a Castro, Thomas Stapleton etc.), the author shows that they were interested primarily in determining the minimum attachment to the Church which would suffice for salvation. The historical situation in which they found themselves made this necessary. Unfortunately theologians have continued this treatment down to the present and it is precisely this orientation which has caused the axiom to be mishandled so often.

In the third section of the article, the author singles out the *in re-in voto* explanation as the "best statement and explanation of the Catholic Church's necessity for salvation. . . ."[41] However it is not the only one possible; one can proceed from the very concept of salvation itself and the dynamic character of charity. Thus salvation necessarily involves a passage from one community to another, as is described in the Acts of the Apostles.[42] The human race is thus divided into two camps, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan,[43] and salvation is precisely the passage of an individual from one kingdom to the other. This passage is effected through charity. In this way the person comes "within" the

---

[39] J. C. Fenton, "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation," *AER*, 124 (1951) 124-143; 203-221; 290-302.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 204.

[41] *Ibid.*, 292.

[42] See Acts 2:40.

[43] Leo XIII, *Humanum genus*, quoted by Fenton, *op. cit.*, 295-296.

Church, since the Church is the kingdom of God on earth and the individual possessing charity is of one mind with the Church in his opposition to evil and his conformity to the will of God. Yet such an individual does not become a member of the Church:

> Thus it follows that the intention of divine charity, the intention to work and struggle for God's supernatural glory in this world is, in point of fact, nothing but a willingness to work for the intention characteristic of and proper to the Catholic Church. It is possible for a man to work for that purpose, to be animated by that intention, without actually being a member of this true and visible Church of Jesus Christ. But it definitely is not possible for a man to work for the intention of charity in this world without finding himself "within" the Church, to the extent that he is laboring in association with it for the very purpose towards which it is directed by its divine constitution.[44]

The individual is within the Church at heart, by desire. His salvation is thus effected "within" the Church. When there is added to this an explanation of how all salvation is effected *per ecclesiam* or how this individual receives graces and charity through the Church and because of the Church's activity, we have a most cogent exposition of the Church's necessity for salvation.

In 1952 John Murphy devoted one chapter of his book on the Mystical Body to "The Church and Salvation." What he presents is actually the double explanation of Bainvel. God decreed that salvation would be given only through the Church; but in this ideal plan God foresaw all the difficulties and even exceptions involved and made provision for them:

> . . . we can see that the axiom states the general plan, but it leaves room for what we may call, in a proper sense, the "exceptions" foreseen by God. In other words, there are those who, through no fault of their own, are outside the Church. They actually are failing to make use of this divinely appointed means of salvation. They will be saved, however, if they serve God as well as they can according to the information they possess.[45]

---

[44] Fenton, *op. cit.*, 297.

[45] J. L. Murphy, *The Living Christ* (Milwaukee 1952) 106.

This explanation represents an extraordinary economy. There can be exceptions to the divine plan because membership in the Church is a relative necessity. What this means practically is that: "God will permit certain dispositions of soul to supply or take the place of actual membership in the Church, and because of those dispositions, God will grant the grace of salvation to the individual."[46] The second part of Father Murphy's explanation explains how even these "exceptions" have some relation to the Church: "While the axiom, 'Outside the Church there is no salvation,' undoubtedly refers to actual membership in the visible Church, there is still a deeper meaning involved in that statement. What some have termed 'exceptions' to the primary or ideal plan of God . . . are really not saved independently of the Church at all."[47] Such people are saved because they have at least an implicit desire for membership and thus pertain to the Church in desire. Finally the author indicates that the two explanations are really equivalent:

> Whether one wishes to interpret the axiom as referring only to actual membership and consider others outside the Church as the divinely intended "exceptions," or whether one wishes to interpret it as meaning "outside either actual membership in the Church, or an implicit or explicit desire for membership there is no salvation," it tells us the same thing. The terms are really a subtle question for theologians to debate. This much is certain, however. Men who are not actual members of the Church can be saved. These "exceptions" are the same individuals whom others refer to as "pertaining to the Church in desire." The names are different, but the group concerned is the same and so also is the theological teaching about them.[48]

Four years later Father Murphy published a second edition of this work; it was, from the beginning intended not only as a reissuing of the same material but a true re-appraisal in depth of his whole work. There is a marked change in his treatment of the

---

[46] *Ibid.,* 107.
[47] *Ibid.,* 116.
[48] *Ibid.,* 117.

Church's necessity. Taking cognizance of the Holy Office Letter and the theological criticism made of his earlier chapter, Murphy eliminates his previous view that the axiom expresses only the general rule and that there are exceptions to it.[49] He establishes the *votum* as *id quo caritas justificat.* Of course his terminology is much less technical: "If we were to take that act of love apart, however, from God's point of view, we would find that one of the essential requirements for the bestowal of sanctifying grace would be the presence, in that act, of at least an implicit desire for the Church. It is this implicit desire that God sees in the act of perfect love on the part of a man outside the Church."[50] This second edition represents a proper progress and clarification in the theological exposition of doctrine. There is but one adverse observation to be made here. The author repeats de Lubac's interpretation of the term *extra* in the sense of "apart from" in order to show that we need not attempt an explanation which "will somehow or other get all of those people to be saved 'inside' the Church."[51] He comments that we cannot hope to have much success "in giving new meanings to old words in order to discuss our theological problems."[52] Such a view places the question in an inadequate perspective. It is not private individuals who give meanings to theological terms. Rather they must strive according to the analogy of faith to determine precisely how the Church herself uses these words; and the proper understanding of this particular doctrine hinges upon the meaning of the word *extra*—the meaning given to it by the Church in placing it in her expression of the dogma. The question then is not a grammatical one to be settled by the dictionary, but a theological one to be investigated according to the analogy of faith.

In *Irénikon* in 1952, Nothomb attempts to reconcile the teaching of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* with that of St. Thomas. After examining the teaching of the encyclical he remarks: "Is it then necessary to conclude that according to this document the

---

[49] J. L. Murphy, *The Living Christ* (2 ed. Milwaukee 1956) 107-109.

[50] *Ibid.,* 121.

[51] *Ibid.,* 108.

[52] *Ibid.,* 109.

Mystical Body of Christ is *adequately* and *exclusively* the Roman Church? We think not, for the following reasons."[53] There are two reasons. First the text of the encyclical is not a real definition, merely a description. Secondly the Mystical Body, according to the encyclical itself, include catechumens, those in heaven and purgatory. Actually then there is no opposition between the Thomistic doctrine and the teaching of Pius XII. Nor is there any opposition on the question of membership. The Pontiff insists upon the visible aspect of membership; but this does not clash with St. Thomas' emphasis upon the possession of sanctifying grace. For the Holy Father describes the Holy Spirit as the soul of the Church; He exists really in the whole and also in each member. Therefore the Pope is also including grace in the notion of membership: ". . . according to Pius XII also, the Christian is constituted a member of Christ, or a member of His Body—it is all the same—because and in the measure that the Holy Spirit moves him, sanctifies him, and finally dwells in him 'in an inscrutable manner,' as the object of knowledge and love."[54] So anyone possessing grace can be called a real true member, though he remains an invisible and incomplete member.[55] But this is not to say Morel is correct in extending the Mystical Body beyond the Roman Catholic Church. The Mystical Body is wider than the *visible aspect* of the Church, to be sure; but the Church has secret prolongations; and the Mystical Body is co-extensive with the Church in its visible aspect, augmented by these prolongations: "The Mystical Body on earth and the Roman Church are, in effect, identified, 'one and the same thing.' But the visible, integral or complete manifestation of this unique reality is more restricted, more confined than its zones of influence, its outlines, or its abnormal prolongations."[56] Nor does this view of the doctrine conflict with the encyclical's teaching concerning membership; the encyclical describes only full membership:

---

[53] "Faut-il en conclure que pour notre document le Corps Mystique du Christ est *adéquatement* et *exclusivement* l'Église Romaine? Il nous semble que non, pour les raisons suivantes." D. M. Nothomb, "L'Église et le Corps Mystique du Christ," *Irénikon,* 25 (1952) 236.

[54] ". . . selon Pie XII également, le chrétien est constitué membre du Christ ou membre de son Corps—c'est tout un—parce que et dans la measure où l'Esprit-Saint le meut, le sanctifie et finalement habite en lui 'd'une manière impénétrabîe,' comme object de connaissance et d'amour." *Ibid.,* 239.

[55] *Ibid.,* 241.

> It [the word *reapse*] expresses a *full,* normal, *integral and completely visible* belonging, which leaves room for a belonging which is *reduced,* inchoative, *partially or completely invisible,* abnormal to be sure, but still a veritable and not an illusive belonging. Numerous theologians, even after the encyclical, instead of speaking of members of the soul of the Church . . . or members of the invisible Church, recognize the existence of *invisible members of the one Church which here on earth is and must be, visible.*[57]

After noting the possibility of degrees of membership, Nothomb describes some of them. First, there is full, integral and completely visible belonging to the Church. These are the people who have fulfilled all the conditions mentioned in the encyclical. Secondly, there is a partially visible belonging, by those who fulfill only some of the conditions. Thirdly there is completely invisible belonging. These are men in the state of grace who have none of the requirements mentioned by the Holy Father. Lastly, there are those who possess a completely invisible and purely potential belonging to the Church. These are men who have none of the requirements of the encyclical, and who do not possess grace, such as pagans and infidels in the state of sin. Those in the second category who possess grace and all those in the third category possess the unconscious desire spoken of by the Pope. Since this effects a real attachment to the Church, Nothomb asks why we cannot speak of "a true, although an imperfect and incomplete belonging."[58] In fact all except those in the last category merit the name of member in one respect or another since they all have some union with the Church.

---

[56] "Corps Mystique terrestre et Église Romaine, en effet, s'identifient, '*sunt idem et unum.*' Mais la manifestation visible intégrale ou achevée de cette unique réalité est plus restreint, plus étroite que sa zone d'influence, ses ébauches ou ses prolongements anormaux." *Loc. cit.*

[57] "Elle exprime une appartenance *plenière,* normale, *intégrale et complètement* visible, qui laisse la place à une appartenance *amoindrie,* inchoative, *partièllement ou complètement invisible,* anormale sans doute mais véritable et non illusoire. De nombreux théologiens, même et surtout après l'Encyclique, au lieu de parler de membres de l'âme de l'Église, comme on disait jadis, ou, ce qui est pire, de membres de l'Eglise invisible, reconnaissent l'existence de *membres invisibles de l'unique Église qui, ici sur terre, est et doit être visible.*" *Ibid.,* 242.

Nothomb's distinctions are not in keeping with the doctrine expressed in the encyclical. His basic mistake lies in the inclusion of grace in the essential concept of membership. He assumes that all in the state of grace must be members of the Mystical Body; this raises a serious problem since all in the state of grace are not members of the Roman Catholic Church. How then can that Church and the Mystical Body be co-extensive? Nothomb has recourse to Journet's theory that the zone of influence of the Church surpasses its visible manifestation; thus the Church exists upon two levels. It seems that Nothomb equates Roman Catholic Church and Mystical Body only by widening the extension of the first entity.

In the same issue of *Irénkon,* Strotmann writes concerning "The Members of the Church." The author insists upon the visible, sociological aspects of membership and mildly criticizes those theologians who approach the question through a consideration of the pneumatical elements. Strotmann tells us that the concept of member found in the encyclical marks an important new orientation in regard to the old scholastic ecclesiological notions. This is not really a new concept; but rather a re-emphasis of something that has long been part of Catholic theology; the sociological aspect of membership. Commenting on the text of the encyclical, Strotmann writes: "Not only the absence of the 'true faith' but—as a corelative element—non-insertion in the sociological structure of the Church excludes one from belonging to the Mystical Body."[59] Strotmann regards the encyclical as a definitive break with the view of Church and member which is based upon the pneumatological aspects instead of the visible, institutional aspects: "These ecclesiastical precisions are unquestionably a new departure. They are a definitive break with the idea that the Church, 'Mystical Body' of Christ, would be above all the assembly of sanctified individuals, united mystically to Christ by ties that are essentially invisible, a spiritual community situated beyond the visible limits of a society characterized as 'juridic.'"[60]

---

[58] ". . . pourquoi ne pas parler d'une veritable appartenance, quoique imparfaite et incomplète?" *Ibid.,* 245.

[59] "Non seulement l'absence de la 'vraie foi' mais—comme un élément correlatif—la non-insertion dans la structure sociologique de l'Eglise exclut encore l'appartenance au corps mystique." D. Th. Strotmann, "Les membres de l'eglise," *Irenikon,* 25 (1952) 252-253.

Strotmann defends this approach of the encyclical, even to its apparent rigor:

> Among the theologians, the classification of members has generally been "ontological." St. Thomas has a conception of the Church that is clearly non-historic and his criteria for the classification of members are essentially "invisible" (grace and sin). The encyclical does not adopt them; its direct concern is the totality of the Church in her redemptive role and considers the quality of member in function of that totality, not from the viewpoint of individual salvation.[61]

The one necessary criterion which justifies speaking of "belonging to the Church," is union with the visible social body. Thus Strotmann emphasizes the social nature of the status of membership, rejecting any approach which would overstress the ontological view of membership. His view then is the direct opposite of Nothomb's. It seems more solidly founded upon the encyclical, whereas Nothomb's interpretation is somewhat forced. Strotmann does not by any means close this issue; but he does defend a simple view of membership with such clarity that no serious objection can be advanced against his position.

---

[60] "Ces precisions ecclésiologiques sont incontestablement un acquis nouveau. Elle rompent definitivement avec l'idée que l'Eglise, 'corps Mystique' du Christ serait surtout l'ensemble des individues sanctifiés, unis mystiquement au Christ par des liens essentiellement invisible, communauté spirituelle située au delà des limites visibles d'une société à caractère 'juridique.'" *Ibid.,* 255.

[61] "Chez les theologiens, le classement des membres a generalement été ontologique. Saint Thomas a de l'Eglise une conception nettement à-historique et ses criteres pour classer les membres sont essentiellement 'invisibles.' (la grâce et le péché) ; l'Encyclique ne les adopte pas; elle a directement en vue la totalité de l'Eglise dans sa fonction redemptrice et considère la qualité de membre en fonction de cette totalité non pas sous l'angle du salut individuel." *Ibid.,* 261.

During the years 1952-1953, Chavasse, Denis and Frisque collaborated in a series of articles which appeared in *Eglise Vivant*. The series was concluded in 1953 with an article entitled, "La croissance temporelle de l'église." This article elaborated two concepts which could have a profound effect upon the understanding of the Church's necessity.

The first concept is that of the cosmic universality of the Church. From the very fact of the Incarnation, all the human race is joined to Christ and thus the Church is, at least in this sense, present to the whole of mankind. This is a concept which has been frequently advanced of late, notably by Holstein. In this article we read:

> The Incarnation has thrust Christ into the primary whole which humanity forms and by reason of this fundamental unity which binds men to Christ, all without exception have derived solidarity from the salvific value of the Cross. On this level, the Church of Christ has attained its universal dimensions immediately. The whole of humanity, elevated by the presence of the Son of God made man, has become the Christian whole; it forms the universal base of *la Catholique*.[62]

The Church is thus realized, even in pagan lands, on a level that is real though invisible. However this universal presence of the Church is not itself sufficient to affect man's destiny:

> But beyond this level of existence where men are originally bound one to the other, men must do their part. They are independent persons and the original bonds which encompass them are not sufficient to affect their

---

[62] "L'Incarnation a insère le Christ dans le tout primaire que forme l'Humanité et, en raison de cette unité fondamentale qui relié les hommes au Christ, tous sans exception ont été rendus solidaires de la valeur salvifique de la Croix. A ce niveau, l'Eglise du Christ a donc atteint aussitôt ses dimensions universelles. Le tout de l'Humanité, surelève comme tel par la presence du Fils de Dieu fait homme, est devenu le tout chretien; il constitue la base universelle de la Catholique." A. Chavasse, H. Denis, & J. Frisque, "La croissance temporelle de l'église," *Eglise Vivant,* 5 (1953) 200.

> personal destiny. Through the activity of the Mediator, the Heavenly Father actively solicits their response and efficaciously works their compliance, whereas they themselves bring to this prevenient divine action, their free adhesion. The historical mission of the Church is then essentially to procure this adhesion of man to God through Christ as the Christian Institute, to procure this free salvific commerce between God and man.[63]

This concept of the cosmic universality of the Church is thus interpreted in such a way as to highlight the necessity of the "institutional" Church and to show that the basic union effected by the cosmic reality is not sufficient to satisfy the necessity of union with the Church. However we may observe that the Church is actually a sociological entity with precise extension; how then can this be universally present in a real, yet invisible way? The fact that the Church is destined to embrace all men must not be regarded as a reality that is already in some way invisibly actualized. Without the authors' insistence upon the necessity of personal activity through the instrumentality of the visible Church, this cosmic universality of the Church would be ruinous of the Church's necessity.

The second concept which affects the Church's necessity is the authors' description of the relation of the *vestigia Ecclesia* to the visible institution. They maintain that the Church must necessarily recognize them as her own:

> For when she [the Church] recognizes the authenticity of Christian elements preserved in the separated communities, the Church energetically refuses to consider them as placed outside of her. . . . And this attitude is

---

[63] "Mais par delà ce niveau d'être où les personnes sont originairement liées les unes au autres, les hommes ont a prendre parti. Ils sont des personnes autonomes et les liaisons originaires qui les enserrent ne suffisent pas à regler leur destinée personnelle. Par l'intermaire du Mediateur, le Père celeste solicite activement leur reponse et il opère efficacement leur acquiescement, tandis qu'eux-mêmes apportent à la prevenance divine leur libre adhesion. La mission historique le l'Eglise est donc essentiellement de procurer cette adhesion de l'Homme à Dieu par le Christ, et c'est la fonction propre de l'Eglise comme Institution Chretienne de procurer ce libre commerce salutaire de Dieu et de l'homme." *Loc. cit.*

> easily understood. If one authentic means of salvation could exist "outside" the Church, she would automatically be deprived of her title of One and Only Church of Christ. She would not be *l'Universelle, La Catholique,* the one which "totalizes" all the means of salvation.[64]

As a result of this view of the *vestiga,* the authors are drawn to make conclusions regarding the extension of the Church:

> . . . the Catholic Church must not be "measured" according to the human criteria of sociology and history. From this point of view the frontiers outlined would pass through the very heart of the Church and, casting all these means of salvation outside, it would divide the seamless garment and would really shatter the One Catholic Church. . . . The real frontier of the Christian Institution passes well beyond the apparent frontier which holds the attention of men. It follows the winding curve which delineates the more or less large number of Christian elements which exist in the separated communities.[65]

This concept cannot be applied to the necessity of the Church without destroying that necessity. The authors do not explicitly apply it; but to do so would be simple enough, hence the importance of questioning strongly the very validity of such an understanding of these *vestiga.* The real extension of the Catholic Church is equal to the extension of its visible sociological structure. This is vital to the very Catholic concept of the Church. Therefore these *vestigia* must be placed outside the Church. There can be no justification for an understanding of these elements which destroy the extension of the Church.

---

[64] "Or, quand elle reconnait l'authenticité des éléments chretiens gardés par la dissidence, l'Eglise refuse energiquement de les considerer comme placés 'hors' d'elle-même. . . . Et l'on comprend aiséement cette attitude. Si un authentique moyen de salut pouvait exister 'hors' de l'Eglise, celle-ci serait automatiquement dechue de son titre d'Unique Eglise du Christ. Elle ne serait plus l'Universelle, la Catholique, celle qui 'totalise' tous les moyens de salut." *Ibid.,* 198.

[65] ". . . l'Eglise catholique ne doit pas être 'mesurée' d'après les criteres humains de la sociologie et de l'histoire. De ce point de vue la frontiere tracée passerait au sein même de l'Eglise et, rejétant au delà tous ces moyens de salut, elle diviserait la Tunique sans couture et briserait réelement l'Eglise une et Catholique. C'est l'Eglise elle même de dire, dans la lumière du Saint Esprit, jusqu'où s'étend l'organization du salut qu'elle est identiquement. La frontière réelle de l'Institution chretienne passe alors bien au delà de la frontière apparente qui retient le regard des hommes. Elle suit la courbe rentrante et sortante que dessine le nombre plus ou moins grand d'elements chretiens qui subsistent dans la dissidence." *Loc. cit.*

In 1952 in *La vera chiesa,* Beni and Cipriani rejected the body-soul explanation, the view which applies the whole doctrine merely to those who are culpably outside the Church. They then present the *in re-in voto* explanation: "There can be no salvation, without belonging to Christ; there can be no belonging to Christ without becoming part of His Church, at least in desire."[66]

In 1954, T. Zapelena published the second edition of his *De ecclesia Christi: pars altera.* His thesis reads simply: "From its institution by Christ, the Church is a necessary means for the salvation of each man."[67] He explains that the Church is necessary both with the necessity of means and the necessity of precept; it is necessary to pertain to the Church either *in re* or *in voto.* This *votum* must be a sincere will of using the means of salvation; not any will suffices: "Therefore a mere will of using the means of salvation is not sufficient; but there is required charity or an act of perfect contrition together with a sincere desire of using all the means of salvation. Moreover *that which* justifies is the act of charity itself, or the act of contrition; but that *by which* charity justifies is the *votum.*"[68]

In explaining the meaning of the axiom, Zapelena rejects the view which applies it only to those culpably outside the Church; also, the body-soul interpretation, even that used in combination with the *in re-in voto* distinction. For individuals cannot pertain to the body in one way and to the soul in another.[69] The only proper understanding of the axiom is that which refers it to those who are in the Church *nec re nec voto.*

---

[66] "Non ci si può salvare senza appartenere a Cristo; non si può appartenere a Cristo senza far parte, almeno *in voto,* della Chiesa." A. Beni & S. Cipriani, *La Vera Chiesa* (Florence 1953) 429.

[67] "Ex institutione Christi Ecclesia est medium ad singulorum salutem necessarium." T. Zapelena, *De ecclesia Christi. Pars altera* (ed. altera Romae 1954) 307.

[68] "Non ergo sufficit mera voluntas adhibendi media salutis; sed requiritur caritas vel actus contritionis perfectae simul cum illo desiderio sincero adhibendi media omnia salutifera. Ceteroquin *id quod* justificat est ipse actus caritas vel contritionis sed *id quo* caritas justificat, est illud votum." *Ibid.,* 308-309.

Relevant also is a scholium appended to the Chapter *De membris Corporis Mystici.* It is entitled *De novitate formulae in E. Mystici Corporis.* Zapelena notes that the two oft-quoted sections of the encyclical depart from the usual terminology of theologians. They have consistently used *"pertinendi ad Ecclesiam in re aut in voto."* The encyclical speaks first of those who are *reapse* members of the Mystical Body; and of those who *"inscio quodam desiderio ac voto ad mysticum Redemptoris corpus ordinentur."*[70] Two precisions in terminology can be noted here: "On one hand in the encyclical the word *pertinere* is (deliberately?) avoided, and in its place another, more general word is used: *ordinare.* On the other hand, the word *votum* is retained, but there is added the word *unconscious."*[71]

Do these represent real changes in terminology? Is the Pope undertaking to determine the position of all those outside the Church? Zapelena is uncertain: "The theological formula *pertinere voto ad Ecclesiam* refers *only* to material dissidents, those in good faith. The new formula of the encyclical: *ordinari voto inconscio,* is more general and seems to be broader in itself it can include *all* dissidents, even formal ones, those in bad faith. Does the expression *de facto* include them, according to the intention of the Pontiff? Some critics say yes. It does not seem so clear to me."[72] He seems inclined to believe that the Holy Father was not deliberately refining the terminology. Nevertheless he does mention four ways in which a person can be related to the Church. 1. *In re* or *reapse;* and this is either a salvific or non-salvific way. 2. *In voto;* either explicitly or implicitly, consciously or unconsciously, salvifically or non-salvifically. The *votum implicit* in contrition would be salvific; that implicit in attrition would not be. 3. A man may be ordained to the Church by a purely objective ordination. This is founded upon the salvific will of God and the elevation of the whole human race to the supernatural order. 4. A man may be ordained to the Church with a subjective ordination. This is founded on personal dispositions, either contrition or attrition; where it is founded upon contrition "it seems to be equivalent to the traditional formula: *pertinere ad Ecclesiam voto.*"[73] Furthermore he states that relation to the Church can be described by the terms *simpliciter* or *secundum quid;* the former is used where all the conditions mentioned in the encyclical's definition of membership are fulfilled; the latter where only some of these conditions are fulfilled.

---

[69] See *ibid.,* 326.

[70] See above, Chapter IX.

[71] "Ex una parte in Encyclica evitatur (deliberate?) vox *pertinere,* eiusque loco usurpatur alia vox generalior *ordinari.* Ex alia parte retinetur quidem vox *votum,* sed additur *inconscium."* Zapelena, *De ecclesia,* 378.

[72] "Formula theologica: *pertinere voto ad Ecclesiam,* respicit *tantum* separatos materiales seu bonae fidei. Formula nova Encyclicae: *ordinari voto inconscio,* generalior est, et latius patere videtur: de se posset includere *omnes* separatos, etiam formales seu malae fidei: num *de facto* includat eos ex intentione Pontificis, aliqui critici id supponunt; mihi non adeo clarum videtur." *Ibid.,* 379.

Zapelena exposes cogently the *in re-in voto* explanation, making maximum use of the Holy Office Letter. Apparently he attaches less significance to the change in terminology in the encyclical than other authors have. He does catalogue the various ways in which men may be related to the Church, carefully distinguishing that relation which is salvific; but he is not strongly impressed by the change in terms. His equating of the "ordination" based upon charity with the old formula *pertinere ad Ecclesiam voto,* strengthens the impression that he is but lightly concerned with the new terminology.

Henry St. John, in 1954, published a series of essays under the title *Essays in Christian Unity.* Appendix III of this book is entitled "Membership of the Church." Here the author takes issue with the opinion that there can be no degrees of membership. He claims that "the very idea of it [membership] includes also the purpose for which that status exists, participation in the life of Christ's Mystical Body, and of this there are varying degrees of perfection."[74] The basis of membership in the visible Church is the sacrament of baptism; the purpose of this status, the life of grace. The character cannot be lost, the grace of Baptism can. Thus the status itself and its purpose are two elements each necessary to integral membership in the visible Church; each separately is capable of constituting in certain circumstances an incomplete membership. A baptized Catholic in the state of grace possesses "integral membership," one in sin has "actual membership . . . but it loses its integrity." Baptized Protestants are members until they reach the use of reason; then if there is no culpable rejection of the Church, they become "members by desire." If they incur personal sin, they will remain members by desire "in virtue of their baptismal character." Those baptized people, Catholic or non-Catholic who reject the Church sinfully remain "in a kind of virtual membership." Those who have only baptism of desire possess a "real though incomplete membership of the Church."[75]

---

[73] ". . . videmur reincidere in formulam traditionalem: pertinere ad Ecclesiam voto." *Ibid.,* 380.

[74] H. St. John, *Essays in Christian Unity* (Westminster, Md. 1955) 137.

St. John defends these distinctions, finding a basis for them in the encyclical. There the Holy Father is speaking of those who are members *"in actuality* and, unless its use here is otiose, the statement implies the possibility of membership in some other way also."[76] Later when the Pope speaks of those united to the Church in desire, he is referring to incomplete membership: "Being related to the Mystical Body implies living by its life, even though in an attenuated degree, and this means being in some sense *in* the Church, and therefore a member of it."[77]

This splitting up of the status of membership stems from the inclusion of the purpose of membership in the definition of the status of membership. It seems, in this, to depart from the encyclical, which defines the status really (*reapse*) without any reference to the purpose. Undue strain must not be placed upon the word *reapse;* it merely signifies those who really and truly are members, setting them apart from those who are not members. It is merely an adverb referring to the real, true state of things, not a philosophical term. Furthermore the term "member in desire" or "incomplete member" was not used in the passage of the encyclical describing those related to the Church by desire. This lends support to the view that the Holy Father wished to restrict the use of the term member to those included in the earlier text. St. John's distinctions destroy the technical nature of the status of membership. Certainly sanctifying grace renders membership integral. But when juridic insertion is lacking membership is essentially lacking.

---

[75] *Ibid.,* 139.

[76] *Loc. cit.*

[77] *Loc. cit.*

In volume four of the *Initiation théologique* series there is a chapter entitled "The Mystery of the Church," written by Liégé. In this chapter he explains the Church's necessity. He first sets aside the Bellarminian concept of the Church as being too juridical, tending to subordinate the concept of the mystery of the Church. He prefers a theological definition which gives prime consideration to the internal life-giving elements of the Church. According to these two definitions, there will be different "titles" for belonging to the Church. According to the Bellarminian concept, the titles will be the character of baptism and aggregation to the ecclesiastical society; according to the theological definition, a member will be one who "will possess within him some element of the divine life communicated in Christ; and, as a subordinate title, the exterior marks of his insertion in the visible community. To belong to the Church then is, in the order of value (which is not of course the order of causality) first of all to belong to its spiritual, vital reality; then as it were inseparably, to belong to its organism of sanctification."[78]

These two views provide the basis for distinguishing the degree of belonging to the Church. Normally the invisible union in grace will suppose insertion in the visible community; but not necessarily: "However it can happen that attachment to the visible community is greatly reduced, or even that the character is not present . . . and nevertheless there are present authentic, though imperfect and abnormal, members of the Church."[79]

---

[78] "D'un point de vue théologique, sera dit membre de l'Eglise celui qui possedera en lui quelque élément de la vie divine communiquée dans le Christ et, à titre subordonne, les marques exterieures de son insertion dans la communauté visible. Appartenir à l'Eglise c'est donc, en ordre de valeur (ce qui ne signifie pas, il va sans dire, en ordre de causalité), d'abord appartenir à sa realité spirituelle et vitale; ensuite, encore qu'inseparablement, appartenir à son organisme de sanctification." P. A. Liégé, "Le mystère de l'Eglise," in *Initiation theologique* (Paris 1954) 4.371.

Coming to the axiom of the Church's necessity, Liégé sees no difficulty, since a man may always be saved by implicit faith. This is the doctrine of tradition. Furthermore, if man is bound by God's ordinances, He Himself is not: "The mercy of God surpasses what theology can say of it, and if men are obliged to use the divinely instituted means for salvation, God Himself is not bound by these means. . . ."[80] Nevertheless the Church remains

> the only hostelry where Christ wishes the citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem to be assembled here below. And if we must concede, in fact, a certain cleavage in the Church on earth, between the Institution in its social, exterior, visible aspect, and the Mystical Body in its spiritual and invisible aspect, we should not say purely and simply that these men become members of the Mystical Body without any reference to the ecclesiastical Institution.[81]

For every man is saved either in the Church or with reference to the Church. This is explained in the Holy Office Letter which Liégé quotes. Those possessing the *votum,* he calls secret members: "These secret members of Christ belong to the Church in both its aspects, but imperfectly." Their status can be explained by making a distinction not in the Church itself, but in their mode of belonging to the Church: "This is why we adopt the expressions: visible belonging and *invisible belonging to the unique spiritual and visible Church.*"[82]

---

[79] "Ill pourra arriver cependant que le rattachement à la communauté visible soit tres reduit, ou même que le caractere n'existe pas . . . et qu'on ait à faire pourtant a des membres authentique, bien qu'imparfaits et 'anormaux' de l'Eglise." *Ibid.,* 371-372.

[80] "La miserciorde de Dieu depasse ce que la théologie peut en dire, et si les hommes sont obligés d'user des moyens divinément institues pour le salut, Dieu ne s'est pas lié, lui, par ces moyens. . . ." *Ibid.,* 373.

[81] ". . . l'unique hotellerie où le Christ veut que soient rassemblés ici-bas les futurs citoyens de la Jerusalem celèste. Et si l'on doit accorder, en fait, un certain decalage dans l'Eglise terrestre entre l'Institution en son aspect social, exterieur et visible, et le Corps mystique en son aspect spirituel et invisible, on ne saurait dire purement et simplement que ces hommes sont devenus membres du Corps mystique sans reference aucune à l'Institution ecclesiastique." *Loc. cit.*

This explanation is built upon the *votum ecclesiae,* but it is confused by Liégé's use of the term "member." Possession of grace constitutes membership in the Mystical Body; visible aggregation to the Church is only secondary and in its absence the status of membership can exist in an abnormal and imperfect degree. This leads the author to distinguish between the Church in her social aspect and the Mystical Body in its spiritual reality. Such a distinction seems to conflict with the statement that the Church and the Mystical Body are one and the same reality. Further, this concept of membership creates difficulties regarding the extension of the Church. Those united to the Church in desire are her secret members; wherever there is divine faith, there is a belonging to the Church which is partial, imperfect, but real; such people are authentic members of the Church. Finally it is at best misleading to say that God is not bound by His ordinances in this matter. This statement plus Liégé's quasi-distinction between the Church and the Mystical Body are not easily reconciled with the proper exposition of the Church's necessity for salvation. Despite these difficulties, Liégé testifies to the growing insistence by theologians that some account be taken of the possession of grace; that it be included in some way in the concept of membership.

In *Lumière et Vie* in November of 1954, Liégé treats this matter more fully. In addition to a more complete elaboration of the above material, he adds a description of an embryonic faith which attaches men to Christ. He recalls St. Thomas' account of the first act of human reason wherein a man either turns toward God or away from Him. This is fundamentally a moral action: "The fundamental moral action of man is rich in an embryonic faith. . . ."[83] This is "a conversion before conversion, a faith before faith, which must normally find its completion and the term of its spiritual dynamism in the attainment of Christ."[84] Even this degree of embryonic faith is sufficient to unite a person to Christ as a member of His Body: "Every faith which unites a man to Christ, no matter how inchoative it may be, incorporates the believer in the mystical community of those whom Christ vivifies, it renders him a member of His Mystical Body: 'I am the vine, you the branches.' "[85] Thus there are degrees of intensity in vital belonging to the Mystical Body, ranging from the blessed in heaven to the non-evangelized who nevertheless possess the truth and who are in good faith.

---

[82] "C'est pourquoi nous adoptons les expressions d'appartenance visible et *d'appartenance invisible à l'unique Eglise spirituelle et visible.*" *Ibid.,* 374.

[83] "L'action morale fondamentale de l'homme est riche d'une foi embryonnaire. . . ." P. A. Liegé, O.P., "Le salut des 'autres,'" *Lumière et vie,* 18 (Nov. 1954) 24.

This concept of embryonic faith does not seem to satisfy the necessity of true supernatural faith; it seems to be something less than this. Further the attachment with the Church consists in the fact that embryonic faith can find its dynamic completion only in the Church; union with the Church is therefore a result, not a cause of salvation.

In volume seven of *Eglise Vivant,* Frisque takes exception to Liége's concept of embryonic faith, saying that this reverses the reality involved. According to Liégé this faith calls for completion in the Church and thus in itself establishes an implicit belonging to the Church. Frisque remarks that any belonging must be in response to a call. There can be no call where the gospel has not even been preached. So if the Church is considered merely a visible organism (as Liégé considers it) then such a call is impossible and so is the embryonic faith of which he speaks. To remedy this defect in Liégé's argument, Frisque reflects upon the necessity of conceiving an actual universality of the Church; this would make the "call" universally possible:

> But does the embryonic faith of which he [Liégé] speaks constitute an implicit belonging to the Church?

---

[84] ". . . une conversion d'avant la conversion, une foi d'avant la foi que normalement doivent s'accomplir et trouver le terme parfait de leur dnyamisme spirituel dans la recontre avec le Christ." *Ibid.,* 25.

[85] "Toute foi qui unit au Christ, aussi inchoativement que ce soit, incorpore le croyant à la communauté mystique de ceux que vivifie le Christ, rend membre de son Corps mystique: 'Je suis la Vigne, vous les sarments.'" *Ibid.,* 28.

> In order to "belong" to the Church, a man must have been "called" by her. What grounds is there for a call when there has not even been an evangelisation? Is it not necessary to conceive a "radical" belonging of every man to the Church, simply because he is a man? And then to admit a veritable actual catholicity of the Church, since the Incarnation, on a level of existence which is to be clearly specified?[86]

This view is given further precision by Frisque in another article which appeared in the same periodical in 1955. Here he develops three points: the universal extension of the Church; the purpose of missionary activity in the Church, the effect of these two truths upon the doctrine of the Church's necessity.

First, the very fact of the Incarnation has brought to the community of men a new relation with Christ; it has effected a universal extension of the Church:

> The Incarnation inserts Christ into the very core of the community of men. The bonds of communion which give the basic concept of man are "modified" by the simple fact of Christ. A man is the Son of God. This fact introduces in the bonds of communion a whole network of purely gratuitous connections, connections of grace. These connections of grace, as bonds of communion which define men, encompass all men; no one escapes them. On the level of which we are speaking, and which is the level of the original reciprocity of human beings, the Church is universal in fact.[87]

---

[86] "Mais la 'foi embryonnaire' dont il nous parle constitue-t-elle une appartenance implicite à l'Eglise? Pour 'appartenir' à l'Eglise, il faut avoir été 'convoqué' par elle. A quel titre y a-t-il convocation, quand il n'y a même pas evangelisation? Ne faut-il pas en arriver à concevoir une appartenance 'radicale' de tout homme à l'Eglise, tout simplement parce qu'il est homme? et donc à admettre une veritable catholicité de fait de l'Eglise, dès l'Incarnation, à un niveau d'existence qu'il s'agira de bien preciser?" J. Frisque, "Y a-t-il salut hors de l'Eglise?" *Eglise vivant* 7 (1955) 66.

[87] "L'Incarnation insère donc le Christ au plus profond de la communauté des hommes. Les liens de communion qui definissent les hommes se trouvent comme 'remaniés," par le simple fait du Christ. Un homme est le Fils de Dieu: ce fait introduit dans les liens de communion tout un reseau de liaisons purement gratuites, de liaisons de grâce. Ces liaisons de grâce, tout comme

Most Catholics imagine that the Church is only the visible assembly of those who are baptized; however reflection upon the mystery of the Incarnation will give us a more exact notion of the universality of the Church.[88]

Secondly, this universality of the Church is based upon personal union with Christ. These individual unions must be "organized" transforming the universality of the Church into a more perfect universal presence:

> Since the Incarnation, the Church can be called "present" to every man; for all are affected by the fact of Christ. This presence we may call an "initial" or "original" presence. There is a presence of the Church in a higher sense, when the Word of God is heard by men in their own language and when the bread of the eucharist is truly shared in a given community. Between these two kinds of presence, there is room for missionary effort. This missionary effort has as its aim making the Church present (in the higher sense) by her Word and Sacraments, to the communities of men, who were strangers to them.[89]

Thirdly, these two truths are of vital importance in understanding the axiom of the Church's necessity. As often as they are overlooked, the axiom is falsified. Unless the Church is understood in this universal sense, grave difficulty will be experienced

---

les liens de communion qui definissent les hommes, enserrent tous les hommes; pas un n'y echappe. A ce niveau dont nous venons de parler et qui est celui de la reciprocité originaire des personnes humaines. l'Eglise est universelle de fait." J. Frisque, "Hors de l'Eglise, il n'y a pas de salut," *Eglise vivant* 7 (1955) 101.

[88] *Loc. cit.*

[89] "Dès l'Incarnation, l'Eglise peut être dite 'present' à tous les hommes; car tous sont touchés par le fait du Christ. Cette presence, appelons-la une presence 'initiale' ou 'originaire.' Il y a une presence d'Eglise au sens fort, quand la Parole de Dieu est entendue par les hommes dans leur propre langue et quand le pain eucharistique est vraiment mis en partage dans une communauté donnée. Entre les deux types de presence de l'Eglise, il y a place pour l'effort missionnaire. Cet effort missionnaire a comme but de rendre l'Eglise presente (au sens fort), par sa Parole et ses Sacrements, à des communautés d'hommes qui, jusque là, y etaient etrangères." *Ibid.*, 105.

in explaining this doctrine. We will have to admit that the Church has *catholicité de droit* but not a *catholicité de fait.* This latter will be only an ideal still to be attained. Some authors; tied to a narrow concept of the Church, have explained the salvation of non-Catholics in such a way as to destroy the absolute necessity of the Church: "Thus in order to acknowledge that non-Christians could be saved, some have appealed to a sort of independent action of the Spirit who breathes where He wills. But as it has been remarked, this concept runs the strong risk of calling into question the absolute necessity of the mediation of Christ, since the Church is the continuation of Christ; and also of forgetting that men are saved only by faith in Christ."[90]

Frisque places the explanation of Liégé in this class, stating that it destroys the role of the Church and conceives union with the Church as a result, not a cause of salvation. Actually there is no necessity of advancing such a weak explanation. The Church is necessary simply because Christ is the only way to the Father. This does not jeopardize the salvation of non-Catholics, however:

> But this does not at all call into question the possibility of salvation for each man, even for the non-Christian. For fundamentally, there is no man who is outside the Church. There is an initial presence of the Church which is universal: all men are called at least "basically"; it is possible then for each one to have authentic faith, although this will be embryonic because it does not lead explicitly to Christ, presented by the Church in the Word and the Sacraments.[91]

---

[90] "Aussi pour admettre que des non-chrétiens puissent être sauvés, certains ont fait appel à une sorte d'action independante de l'Esprit qui souffle où il veut. Mais, comme on l'a fait remarquer, cette conception risque fort de mettre en question l'absolue necessité de la mediation du Christ, puisque l'Eglise c'est le Christ continue, et de faire oublier que les hommes ne sont sauvés que dans la foi au Christ." *Ibid.,* 103-104.

[91] "Mais celà ne met nullement en question la possibilité pour tout homme, même non-chrétien, d'être sauvé. Car hors de l'Eglise, il n'y a fondamentalement aucun homme. Il y a une presence initiale de l'Eglise qui est universelle: tous les hommes sont convoqués au moins 'à la racine,' il y a donc pour chacun d'eux possibilité d'une foi authentique, encore qu' embryonnaire puisqu'elle ne conduit pas explicitement au Christ donné par l'Eglise dans la Parole et les Sacraments." *Ibid.,* 107.

Truly Frisque avoids the difficulty implicit in Liégé's explanation, but creates a more serious one. He establishes a union with the Church, but the Church of which he speaks is not the Church Militant of the New Testament: the Roman Catholic Church. In fact Frisque rejects this concept of Church as one which can only cause misunderstanding of this doctrine. The Church of which he speaks is one which includes all men, by the very fact that they are members of the human race. Thus Frisque's approach rests upon a very serious distortion of the Catholic concept of Church.

Brunet takes up the question of membership in the *Analecta Gregoriana* in an article entitled, "Are Dissidents in Good Faith Members of the Church?" Since it is apparent to all that *material heretics possess the sacrament* of baptism and may possess sanctifying grace, can we possibly deny them the appellation of member simply because they are inculpably separated from the Church? Before taking up the question directly, Brunet rejects the answer given by Malvy in 1927. He had stated that a person baptized in infancy in an heretical sect "can lose his quality of member of the Church only by a personal act which is a mortal sin; an error professed without fault on his part does not suffice, for 'once incorporated into the body of the Church a person can leave only by a formal and voluntary grave fault.' "[92]

Brunet, however, indicates that the status of membership ceases the day the individual places an external act of adherence to the non-Catholic religious group. For the conclusion from the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* is that it is precisely visible attachment which must be considered in the question of membership. Not only the *fault* of heresy, but also the *visible attitude* of heresy suffices to deprive one of the quality of member.[93] After expressing dissatisfaction with the body-soul distinction, Brunet points out that the concept of Mystical Body as elaborated by St. Paul is that of a body essentially but not merely visible. With this criterion, he then describes the various conditions of good infidels, good dissidents, and bad Catholics. The good infidel is capable of being saved, but is not a member of the Church since he does not bear external witness to Christ; the good dissident likewise is not a member since his acceptance of only part of the message of Christ keeps him from being a witness to Christ.[94] The bad Catholic remains a member of Christ because of his adhesion to the living body, even though he is an infirm member. Thus Brunet recognizes the high spiritual value of participation in the life of Christ, but he is adamant in reserving the term member for those who are visibly united with the Church. This is, for him, a necessary position according to the teaching of Pope Pius XII.

---

[92] ". . . il ne peut perdre sa qualité de membre de l'Eglise que par un acte personnel qui soit un péché mortel; une erreur professée sans faute de sa part n'y suffit pas, car 'une fois incorporé au corps de l'Eglise, on n'en peut sortir que par une faute formelle et volontairement grave.' " R. Brunet, S.J., "Les dissidents de bonne foi, sont-ils membres de l'eglise," *Analecta* Gregoriana, 68, series fac. theol., sectio A. n. 11 (Rome 1954) 201.

[93] "Ce n'est pas *la faute* d'hérésie ou de schisme qui constitue l'obstacle a l'effet du baptême sur ce point; c'est *l'attitude visible,* même non coupable, qui, en faisant adhérer à une confession mutilée ou separée, supprime la qualité de membre du seul corps qui prolonge authentiquement le Christ." *Ibid.,* 203.

In his recent *De ecclesia,* Mors has this thesis: "For all men, the Church of Christ is necessary for the attainment of salvation, both with the necessity of precept and the necessity of means."[95] Necessity of means is that which must exercise a positive influence. Nothing can supply for the influence of this means, yet in certain cases it can be used sufficiently if possessed only in desire. This desire must be "a sincere will of entering the Church, together with an act of perfect charity (contrition)."[96] Those who possess this desire are not merely related to the Church, but in some way they have already entered the Church. Mors explains this in a scholium: " 'union with the Church in desire' is not a mere desire of a man of entering the Church to which he does not yet really pertain; but it is something of a true, though imperfect entrance. . . . He is not yet actually a member of the visible Church, but because of his desire he is subject in some way, imperfectly to be sure but still truly, to the sanctifying influence of the Church."[97]

---

[94] *Ibid.,* 213.

[95] "Ecclesia Christi omnibus hominibus ad salutem consequendam necessaria est necessitate praecepti et medii." J. Mors, S.J., *Theologia fundamentalis* (Buenos Aeris: 1955) 2.208.

[96] "Votum hoc est nihil aliud nisi seria voluntas ingrediendi Ecclesiam coniuncta cum actu caritatis perfectae." *Ibid.,* 208.

Hence Mors defends the absolute necessity of some salvific influence on the part of the Church; furthermore those who possess the *votum* must be counted as "in" the Church even though they are not members.

The *Proceedings* of the 1955 convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America contained an article by Francis Shea entitled, "The Principles of Extra-Sacramental Justification in Relation to 'Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus.'" After quoting from a long list of magisterial documents, the author gives substantially the explanation of Caperan, though some of the latter's precision is missing, especially in describing extraordinary means of salvation: "Extraordinary means will be used where the ordinary and normal are lacking."[98] The Church is described as the "ordinary channel of salvation."[99] Regarding the salvation of non-Catholics the author concludes: "To the extent that they arrive at a supernatural act of faith joined with hope and perfect charity they are assured of justification and salvation. To the same extent they are united to the soul and body of the Visible Church, and the age-old dogma of the Church still stands: Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus."[100] The author is of the opinion that justified non-Catholics "pertain to the Soul of the Church really. . . . They pertain also to the visible body of the Church but only *in voto*."[101]

This attempt to incorporate both the body-soul distinction and the concept of extraordinary means of salvation is evidence of the theologians' slowness in discarding completely these two concepts.

John Castelot and William Murphy have prepared an English translation of Van Noort's *De ecclesia.* Extensive revision has resulted in a complete rewording of the thesis. It reads: "By Christ's institution the Roman Catholic Church is necessary for salvation for every man by necessity of means."[102] This necessity of means is not an absolute, but a disjunctive necessity. Van Noort's division into absolute and relative is replaced by absolute-disjunctive. The terminology is the same as Salaverri's. The term disjunctive is explained thus: "one must be joined to the Church if not in fact, at least in desire."[103] It would perhaps be more expressive of the Church's exclusive role if the distinction between absolutely and disjunctively necessary means were omitted. This clarity is perfectly expressed in a corollary which reads: "Some union with the Church, at least in desire, is absolutely necessary for all men for salvation."[104] In a scholium explaining the axiom, there is much confusion. First we read: "The axiom should be strictly understood as referring to actual union with the visible Church; but its full correct meaning is: anyone who *by his own fault* lives and dies outside the Church will definitely be damned."[105] Again they repeat the historical and theological interpretations of Brunsmann. This distinction is groundless and constitutes a dangerous methodology in interpreting the documents of the Church. However the "theological" meaning is well expressed: "no one is saved who *in no wise whatsoever* belongs to the visible Church even in implicit desire."[106]

---

[97] "Quare 'coniunctio cum Ecclesia per votum' non est merum desiderium alicuius hominis ingrediendi Ecclesiam, ad quam realiter nondum pertinet; sed est verus aliquis ingressus, licet imperfectus. Qui justificatur voto Ecclesiae, nondum quidem actu pertinet ad visibilem externamque Ecclesiae communionem, sed sanctificatur gratiis, quae sunt Ecclesiae, sicuti fere qui sanctificatur per sacramenta extra Ecclesiam collata. Nondum actu est membrum Ecclesiae visibilis; sed propter votum iam subest aliquatenus, imperfecte quidem sed vere, influxui sanctificatori Ecclesiae." *Ibid.*, 217.

[98] F. Shea, "Principles of Extra-Sacramental Justification," *Proceedings* (N. Y. 1955) 147.

[99] *Ibid.*, 146.

[100] *Ibid.*, 149.

[101] *Ibid.*, 141-142.

Certainly the general exposition has taken cognizance of the great development in explaining this doctrine which has occurred since the time of Van Noort. It no longer speaks, as he did, of the Church being the ordinary means of salvation. It is perhaps a weakness that a simple understanding of necessity of means was not accepted. Van Noort's distinction between absolute and relative has been removed and this represents a true progress; but the inclusion of the distinction between an absolutely and disjunctively necessary means continues some of the confusion of the earlier terminology. The corollary stating the absolute necessity of union with the Church at least in desire is most cogent and could perhaps have been more centrally placed. The explanation of the axiom is unfortunate as it perpetuates several of the old errors.

---

[102] J. Castelot & W. Murphy, Christ's Church (Westminster, Md. 1957) 258.

[103] *Ibid.,* 264.

[104] *Loc. cit.*

[105] *Ibid.,* 265.

[106] *Ibid.,* 266.

So while the explanation is truly progressive and generally accurate, some of the terminology employed detracts from the clarity of the exposition.

In *Euntes Decete* in 1957, J. Vodopivec makes a masterful study of the various ways of belonging to the Church in an article entitled, "Members *in re* and Belonging *in voto* to the Church of Christ." First he considers the status described by the phrase "belonging to the Church." This is not merely a relation in the intentional order, something devoid of life and ecclesiastical reality. It is a belonging to the Church which exists in the order of reality: "Member *in voto* does not at all indicate that the dissidents are totally and completely excluded from the internal supernatural reality which constitutes and characterizes the members *in re*."[107] An adequate appreciation of this term depends upon a full understanding of the use of the *in re-in voto* distinction in sacramental theology when it was transferred to ecclesiology. When the Council of Trent spoke of the *votum baptismi* it did not mean *any* desire of baptism, but precisely that desire which was founded upon an act of perfect contrition.[108] The use of the same term by St. Thomas indicates that the sacrament is already possessed in some way: "St. Thomas observes in a certain way that even the desire of baptism already attains and implies Christian baptism in some way and that therefore those who are justified by an act of perfect love in fact possess baptism in some way."[109] So the *votum* is the same as it was in sacramental theology; it signifies a spiritual reality. The significance of the term is to be understood according to its use in the documents of the authentic magisterium, therefore Vodopivec examines the documents *Mystici Corporis* and *Suprema haec sacra.* Herein the term member is used very strictly; the belonging in desire to the Church is evidently something less than membership:

---

[107] "Membro in voto non indica affato una totale e completa esclusione dei dissidenti dall'intera realtà soprannaturale la quale constituisce e caratterizza i membri in re." G. Vodopivec, "Membri in re ed appartenenza in voto alla Chiesa di Cristo," *Euntes Docete* 10 (1957) 68.

[108] *Ibid.*, 70.

[109] "S. Tommaso osserva da una parte che ance il voto del battesimo già attinge ed implica in qualche modo il battesimo cristiano e che quindi anche coloro che sono giustificati mediante l'atto di amore perfetto *hanno* di fatto in qualche modo il battesimo." *Ibid.*, 72.

> . . . in the official documents the language is such as to indicate with a constancy and also a certain insistence that the Church considers only faithful Catholics as her *reapse membra,* as really and truly members of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ. The official documents do not bestow on the dissidents, even those in good faith, the name of member; they say instead only that they belong in desire and longing, that they are ordained toward the Church, the Body of Christ. What else does this mean except that, according to the Church's own understanding, they are not really and truly members of the Church?[110]

A different status is indicated by the phrase, *belonging to the Church in desire;* but this status is still one of immense spiritual value; it signifies the possession of charity: ". . . not any desire suffices for the salvation of the dissidents, but there is demanded together with the desire an act of perfect love, an act which involves a vital fullness of the grace, virtue and operation of the Holy Spirit in the soul. Nevertheless, to be a member of the Church signifies still more than this, it signifies a much greater spiritual richness, it signifies real incorporation into the Mystical

---

[110] ". . . nei documenti ufficiali il linguaggia è tale da indicarci con costanza ed una certa insistenza che la Chiesa considera soltanto i fedeli cattolici come suoi *reapse membra,* come veramente e realment membri delle Chiesa, Corpo mistico di Cristo. Ai dissidenti, anche se in buona fede, i documenti ufficiali non acconsentono l'appellativo del membro, dicono invece soltanto che essi appartengono in voto ed in desiderio, che si trovano ordinato verso la Chiesa, Corpo di Cristo. Che altro vuole dire questo se non che essi, secondo la conscienza propria alla Chiesa, non sono veramente e realmente membri delle Chiesa?" *Ibid.,* 81.

Body of Christ which is the Church."[111] Those who have this desire are then emphatically not members of the Church. However Vodopivec seems to tolerate some freedom here in order to avoid mere semantics: "To avoid purely verbal arguments, we add this: whoever wishes at all costs to call these people 'members,' should specify that he is concerned only with members *in voto* and not with those who are really and truly members.

Although not explicitly mentioned in these documents, this belonging *in voto* can have various foundations. The pagan in good faith and the separated Christian in good faith are certainly related to the Church in different degrees: "The salvific desire can be founded upon different levels of spiritual intensity, but the degree strictly necessary for eternal salvation is always that of an act of perfect supernatural love."[113] The bonds which can unite the dissident with the Church are varied, but it is imperative to note that not every one of these bonds constitutes a true *votum*. These bonds of union can range all the way from the sacramental bonds of the oriental separatists to the natural morality of pagans and the universal potency all men have for incorporation into the Mystical Body. Vodopivec, then, distinguishes three forms of "attachment" to the Church; none of which necessarily includes the others. There is: *union, belonging in voto,* and *membership*. The first may be anything from the valid sacrament of baptism to mere potentiality. The second is founded always on faith and charity. The third is present only where the conditions laid down by Pius XII are verified. Baptized non-Catholic adults are certainly united to the Church by the fact of their baptism; if they are without Charity, they are without the *votum;* the very fact of their being separated from the Church prevents them from being members. Their incorporation as members is destroyed "by the sole fact of their humanly willed and visibly affirmed separation from the social company of the one true Church of Christ, even though this be without grave sin.[114]

---

[111] ". . . cioè che per la salvezza dei dissidenti non è sufficiente qualsiasi voto, ma si esige insieme con il voto anche l'atto di amore perfetto, un atto che coinvolge una vitale pienezza di grazia, virtù ed operazione dello Spirito Santo nell'anima. Tuttavia, essere membro della Chiesa significa più di questo ancora, significa un ben maggiore ricchezza spirituale, significa l'incorporazione reale nel Corpo mistico di Cristo che è la Chiesa." *Loc. cit.*

[112] "Per evitare litigi puramente verbali aggiungiamo ancora: chi volesse ad ogni costo chiamarli 'membri,' deve però specificare se si tratta soltanto dei membri in voto e non dei membri veramente e realmente tali." *Loc. cit.*

[113] "Il voto salvifico può essere strutturato su diversi piani di intensità spirituale, ma il grado strettamente necessario per la salvezza eterna è sempre quello dell'atto di amore perfetto soprannaturale." *Ibid.,* 82.

Authors sometimes refer to these dissidents in good faith as incomplete, invisible, initial, potential or virtual members. When they use such terms they are seeking to give expression to the real bonds of union with the Church which these individuals possess; also to distinguish the differences between them, as for instance between a baptized non-Catholic and an un-baptized pagan. The difference between them is real, but the terms used to express this difference are confusing; they do not recognize the technical status of membership as well as the diverse manners in which an individual can be "attached" to the Church:

> It will be useful here to repeat that *union, belonging,* and *member,* of the Church are not univocal but proportionately analogous concepts, founded in progressive gradation upon different levels. Still in saying that the dissidents in good faith belong to the Church only in desire, there is no danger of placing indiscriminately on the same level all the dissidents and all the pagans of good faith. The real gradation is effected both above and below the level of the salvific *votum.* The *votum* itself contains real, visible, supernatural elements. It is this fact that authors generally wish to stress by claiming for the dissident the title of incomplete, virtual, initial members etc. Nevertheless: real union and real bond with the Church is one thing, to be a member *in re* of the Church is another. Not every real relation with the Church is sufficient to constitute a member *in re* of the Church.[115]

---

[114] "Agli occhi ed al giudizio della Chiesa è cessata dunque la loro incorporazione in qualità di veri e reali membri avutasi in precedenza per il solo fatto della loro separazione umanamente voluta et visibilmente affermata, pur senza peccato grave, dalla compagine sociale dall'unica vera Chiesa di Cristo." *Ibid.,* 95.

[115] "Sarà utile ripetere che *l'unione, l'appartenenza, il membro,* della Chiesa non sono concetti univoci ma proporzionalmente analoghi, strutturati in progressiva gradazione su diversi piani. Anche dicendo che i separati di

Vodopivec does not expressly disavow these qualifications of the term member. Their use is difficult since they must constantly be clearly set apart from real true membership; their very use tends to obscure the extremely penetrating distinction between union, belonging and member. In his conclusion he insists upon conditions of membership as stated in the encyclical; belonging in desire is something different from this: "he who belongs to the Church only in desire is not truly a real member of the Church."[116] The status of membership is a technical status, one set apart from the myriad forms of union with the Church which human reason can elaborate: "Not every participation in grace and divine life, nor every indelible bond, not any visible tie whatsoever, renders the subject a real true member of the Church."[117]

Vodopivec is clear in distinguishing the salvific *votum* from the status of membership; he also points out that there are many bonds of possible union with the Church, which in themselves constitute neither the votum nor membership. However these two states can be built upon varying combinations of bonds of union and in this sense they can be used analogously. But these qualifications are accidental and in using adjectives with the term "member" to express the presence of these bonds, an author must be most careful not to destroy the substantial difference which exists between belonging to the Church in desire and membership. Therefore while he does not reprove the use of such terms as initial, imperfect member etc., Vodopivec does indicate the confusion these

---

buona fede appartengano alla Chiesa soltanto in voto, non vi è pericolo di porre allo stesso livello indistintamente tutti i separati e tutti i pagani di buona fede. La gradazione reale si effettua tanto al di sopra come al di sotto del voto salvifico. Il voto stesso comprende elementi reali, soprannaturali, visibili. È questo che vogliono inculcare generalmente gli autori rivendicando per i separati il titolo di membri incomplete, virtuali, iniziali etc. Tuttavia: altro è unione e vincolo reale con la Chiesa, altro essere membro *in re* della Chiesa. Non ogni relazione reale con la Chiesa è già sufficiente per constituire un membre *in re* della Chiesa." *Ibid.,* 100.

[116] ". . . non è veramente membro reale della Chiesa chi le appartiene soltanto *in voto.*" *Ibid.,* 102.

[117] "Non ogni partecipazione alla grazia ed alla vita divina, non ogni vincolo indelebile, non qualsiasi legame visibile rendono il soggetto membro vero e reale della Chiesa." *Ibid.,* 103.

terms can bring to the understanding of the true status of membership. This latter status is verified only where all the conditions of Pope Pius XII are verified; in this sense it is indivisible.

4. SUMMARY

The newer works by the school theologians have universally adopted the *in re-in voto* explanation. This is used by Salaverri, Denis, Dellevalle, Beni, Zapelena, Mors. The Church is described as a necessary cause of salvation or at least a *conditio sine qua non.* The *votum* is one based on supernatural faith and charity. The body-soul explanation is completely eliminated; even Hugon's restricted use of this distinction finds extremely few advocates; such an explanation is explicitly rejected by Zapelena.

In other theological works however, and especially in periodical writings, there are positions which conflict with this *in re-in voto* explanation. Journet finds that all who are saved are indeed united to the Church; but the Church is not the cause of this salvation except in the case of full, visible members; invisible members are brought to salvation by the direct action of Christ and their attachment to the Church is a result of salvation. Holstein, Frisque, Chavasse and Denis propose a universality of the Church which removes any necessity for union with the Roman Catholic Church. Nothomb widens the concept of Church in order to equate it adequately with the Mystical Body.

The most energetic theological activity is concerned with describing man's relations with the Church and with the precise understanding of the term member. The encyclical *Mystici Corporis* had used *ordinentur* in referring to those who possessed the *votum salvificum. Human Generis* spoke of a *necessitas pertinendi ad ecclesiam.* The letter of the Holy Office used both *ordinentur* and *adhaereat* to describe the actual situation of those possessing the *votum.* These later documents do not at all support the theory that the terminology of *Mystici Corporis* was a deliberate adjustment of the traditional *pertinendi ad ecclesiam.*

Among theologians the possession of sanctifying grace is still included in the concept of membership. This forms the basis for many distinctions. Journet distinguishes a great many degrees of belonging to the Church. His inquiry is primarily philosophical; it does not sufficiently observe the definition of Pius XII. He exposes masterfully the various bonds which can be the source of union with the Church, but by making all these degrees of membership, he obscures the preferred position: real true membership. For Nothomb membership is necessarily contained in the possession of sanctifying grace; so non-Catholics in the state of grace are real, though imperfect members. St. John unites the status and the purpose of membership; wherever grace is, there also must membership be. Strotman, Brunet, Fenton insist upon the visible nature of membership. They regard it as distinct from belonging *in voto.* Vodopivec, in large measure, resolves these two positions. With the first group he recognizes the various sources of union with the Church, especially faith, the sacraments, grace, preaching of the word etc. But he denies that they confer membership. These bonds will not even constitute belonging *in voto* unless charity is present. He seems reluctant to disapprove absolutely such terms as initial or imperfect member; to avoid semantic arguments, he accepts them if sedulously distinguished from real true membership.

As we shall mention in the general conclusion, the question is not yet resolved; though ultimate resolution of the problem will perhaps not differ greatly from the position of Vodopivec. It seems certain that the ultimate position will be founded upon his distinction between *union, belonging in voto* and *membership.*

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The magisterial statements incorporated into this study have trenchantly expressed a principle which was implicit in earlier documents: it is absolutely necessary that the Roman Catholic Church exercise a causal influence upon the salvation of every man. This influence is of such a nature that it can be asserted that no man is saved outside the Roman Catholic Church. This is the keystone of the whole doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation. An explanation which omits this principle will be deficient; inclusion of any element which contradicts this principle will render an explanation inadequate. Although this view has been defended frequently in the theology of the past one hundred years, progression towards its universal acceptance has been erratic. Certainly the explanation of this doctrine is today vastly improved over what it was in the time immediately preceding the Vatican Council. Yet throughout the intervening years there has been the continued recurrence of inadequate concepts. These concepts have varied one from another, but they have all found their common source in a failure to assert clearly that the Roman Catholic Church is the only source of supernatural life for man; as if such an admission could work only to the detriment of man's spiritual welfare. Consequently there have been repeated attempts to vindicate the existence of a true supernatural life apart from any influence exerted by the Roman Catholic Church.

Prior to the Council theologians generally used either the simple body-soul explanation, or the concept of the Church as the ordinary way of salvation; or else they applied the doctrine only to those culpably outside the Church. The few like Schrader, who described the Church as necessary both with the necessity of means and the necessity of precept, made no further elaboration. There was in this period no general insistence that *some* union with the Church was indispensable.

The statements of Pope Pius IX were of a markedly different tone. He did require some union with the Church. According to the needs of his time, he stressed the fact that no one was condemned who was without culpability. Though this statement has often been misunderstood, it was in no way a limitation imposed by the Holy Father upon the universal necessity of the Church. Disinterested study of his statements reveals that the Holy Father established three principles as essential to the understanding of this doctrine: 1. The necessity of the Church is absolute, suffering no exceptions. 2. Some union with the Church is absolutely necessary for the salvation of each individual. 3. This union is not necessarily the status of actual membership. In addition, the general dispositions which, according to Pius IX make the salvation of non-Catholics possible, are quite compatible with the dispositions to which subsequent theology has given the term *votum ecclesiae*.

Many factors prevented this pontifical teaching from becoming the essential framework within which theologians would henceforth explain this doctrine. First there was the general nature and somewhat cumbersome phraseology of the statements themselves. They did not pretend to give a scientific explanation of the doctrine, but rather general principles which must be taken as a foundation for such an explanation. Secondly, the Vatican Council issued no definitive teaching concerning this doctrine. The *schema* and *adnotationes* show how extensively the statements of Pius IX were used. They show also the sharp difference among some of the consultors. Some deemed it sufficient merely to say that no one culpably outside the Church could be saved. This had been the consensus of the pre-conciliar theological works. It was precisely this attitude which the statements of Pius IX sought to correct. This latter fact was recognized by others among the consultors and so they attempted to amend the text accordingly. However objection was raised against the terminology *in re* and *in voto*. This difference of views was not resolved. It was this uncertainty regarding the interpretation of the words of Pius IX which was bequeathed to theologians. Thirdly we have Newman's serious misunderstanding of the meaning of these texts. He read out of them the simple body-soul explanation. He was convinced Pius IX was calling attention to cases which were exceptions to the necessity of the Church. He did not regard the intervention of the Church as necessary in every case. These three views have been repeated frequently down to the present day.

Although the words of Pius IX did not succeed in fastening Catholic theology to a clearly absolute exposition of this doctrine, they did succeed in moving the general emphasis of theologians away from the inadequate explanations prevalent before the Council. The variety of explanations among the authors immediately following the Council was indeed great; the body-soul explanation was still being used, as was the explanation that saw only necessity of precept and the description of the Church as only the ordinary way of salvation. However the largest bloc of theologians combined several explanations, some of them mutually contradictory. Yet amid the diverse elements, the necessity of some attachment to the Church was frequently in evidence. This marked a definite shift from the pre-Conciliar approach.

This tendency to demand some union with the Church continued in the remaining years of the century. The simple body-soul explanation and the explanation which included only necessity of precept were soon no longer presented as explanations adequate in themselves. They continued to be used, but now as single elements of the eclectic explanations which became common.

Most frequently the authors tried to unite the *in re-in voto* with the body-soul explanation. Nor was there any reluctance to include other elements, so that the explanations of the time were often a simple accumulation of disparate elements. By 1890 authors generally demanded some union with the Church, thus adopting the view of those conciliar Fathers who thought it insufficient merely to state that those culpably outside the Church could not be saved. This latter statement is no longer accepted by theologians as an adequate explanation. This practice of demanding some union with the Church reached a high degree of perfection in the treatises of Franzelin in 1887 and Straub in 1890 both of whom made it clear that the *votum ecclesiae* was absolutely essential for those who were not actually members of the Church. The great study of Dublanchy in 1895 was the product of this trend. However this work is somewhat unsatisfying in that the supernatural reality of the *votum* is not made clear.

The tendency to combine the *in re-in voto* and the body-soul explanations culminated in Hugon's presentation in 1907. Though a masterful work, it was not destined to have a large influence. So apparent had become the limitations of the body-soul distinction as used by Hugon, that theologians became more and more reluctant to employ it even when combined with other explanations. This distinction was founded upon a faulty understanding of the soul of the Church which was taken as the community of those possessing sanctifying grace. It minimized the importance of the *votum ecclesiae* by dwelling almost exclusively upon the importance of grace. Pope Leo XIII had already stated that the Holy Spirit was the soul of the Church and that the body and soul of the Church were not to be separated. These statements presented further difficulties for Hugon's explanation. While it was used by some theologians, it never gained a universal acceptance.

There is a third factor which was present in the theology of the turn of the century. It is important not to overlook this factor and yet it is difficult to describe it briefly. It is perhaps best reducible to this: theologians sometimes used principles in their explanations which were incompatible with the generally accepted fact that some union with the Church was absolutely necessary for salvation. For example: toward the end of the century some authors used the term member in a wide sense. There were invisible members for Franzelin, virtual and moral members for Schanz, invisible members for Hunter. Dublanchy objected strongly to this manner of speaking because of the weakening of the concept of the Church's visibility which would result. More important than this, however, was the serious alteration Emile Bougaud had brought to the traditional teaching of the Church's extension; for him the Church possessed secret prolongation; it included all those in the state of grace. These tenets served to prolong well into the twentieth century the use of the body-soul distinction by the apologists and catechists even after the theologians had rejected the distinction as being inadequate. The vehement writings of Coppins indicate how strongly theologians objected to the use of this distinction. Also in this general category of explanations which are incompatible with the generally accepted fact that some union with the Church was absolutely necessary for salvation, we can include the thesis that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation. This was the basic explanation of Van Noort, Michelitsch, Reinhold, and Laxenaire. Such a view is found in an incidental way in the writings of Billot, Orain, O. Mazzella.

These factors were often widely scattered among the authors. They were often merely single elements in an eclectic explanation. Yet taken together they represent a sharp departure in perspective from the general consensus that some union with the Church is absolutely necessary. When these elements were gathered together (as in Bougaud's work), they were an effective denial of the necessity of some union with the Church. If we set aside the explanation of Hugon as one which was to prove of only passing interest, we will see that there was a serious cleavage in the approach to the doctrine of the Church's necessity. Many explanations were cumbersome. Generally they demanded some union with the Church; but there is decernible an attitude which is in direct variance with this general approach.

This ambivalence grew out of a great eagerness to defend the truly universal nature of God's salvific will. The school theologians gravitated toward the *in re-in voto* explanation while others sought what they thought was a more realistic and more meaningful explanation. They succeeded only in continuing a confusion that should have ended with the appearance of such explanations as those of Billot, Straub, Leboucher and Franzelin. The divergent tendencies were brought together in the classic study of Caperan in 1912. Caperan raised the whole development of the doctrine to a higher plane. By finalizing the rejection of the body-soul explanation he ended the old ambivalence between that and the *in re-in voto* explanation. He replaced it with a more subtle one; but one equally inconclusive. Forming as it does a radical reorientation of the treatment of this doctrine, the study of Caperan is easily misunderstood. To understand it aright the progress of the doctrine up to his day must be clearly preceived.

Before the Vatican Council it was widely thought that the doctrine was sufficiently explained if it was stated that no one culpably outside the Church could be saved; or by stating that it was necessary to belong to the soul of the Church. The statements of Pius IX accentuated the importance of union with the Church and after the Council it was this view which became more and more prevalent. It fastened upon the *in re-in voto* explanation which was used first together with the body-soul distinction, then in opposition to it. Hugon's attempt to synthesize the two explanations did not meet with widespread success and finally the *in re-in voto* explanation was used alone. Alongside this trend there was also the incorporation of elements which clashed with this absolute view. It is in this period of general use of the *in re-in voto* explanation that Caperan's study was made. There is absolutely no hope of comprehending Caperan's work unless it is realized that it is precisely acceptance of this *in re-in voto* explanation which forms the starting point of his inquiry. For him the Church is absolutely necessary for salvation; he understands this to mean that union with the Roman Catholic Church is an absolute necessity. All human beings who attain salvation, attain it in and through the Roman Catholic Church. This fundamental view explains Caperan's repeated insistence that he does not wish to derogate from that necessity in the slightest.

This appreciation of Caperan's study enables one to grasp the new direction he gives the doctrine. He accepts the *in re-in voto* explanation but seeks what few before him sought, an explanation of the manner in which the Church can save those who are not her members. For this purpose he employs a concept which had been becoming more and more popular, the concept of extraordinary means of salvation. These Caperan reduced to the good elements in non-Catholic religions and the interior illumination of an individual by God. Most emphatically he denied that any man was saved *because of* the practice of a false religion; rather he was saved *in spite of it.* All who were saved by these extraordinary means were saved in the Church and by the Church. Yet for all of this, Caperan's basic comprehension of these extraordinary means was faulty. They never acted in concurrence with the ordinary means; their role was supplementary. The very purpose of their existence was to effect salvation in areas where the ordinary means, the Church, was ineffective.

This fundamental flaw actually accomplished what Caperan was so anxious to prevent; it detracted from the absolute, universal necessity of the Church. If this flaw is recognized for what it is, an unsuccessful attempt to understand how the Church can exercise a universal salvific influence, much of its destructive force is removed. But if later authors were to accept this view of extraordinary means of salvation as Caperan's fundamental position, then the development of the doctrine would be entering an entirely new phase. This is exactly what happened.

One of the first to misconstrue Caperan's words was J. V. Bainvel. His small brochure, devoted exclusively to the Church's necessity, was of a more popular style and thus even more influential than Caperan's. Yet all he did was expand Caperan's view of the extraordinary means of salvation. Bainvel described an extraordinary economy of salvation wherein God came into direct contact with humanity. The Church was only the ordinary economy. He attempted to unite the two economies by indicating, as Caperan had, that those saved by the extraordinary means were related to the Church. This served only to make union with the Church a *result* of salvation, not a *cause*.

Very effectively then, the direction of the theological development was altered. The *in re-in voto* explanation was still generally accepted, to be sure; but the attempts to explain the nature of the *votum* actually destroyed the view which the *in re-in voto* distinction so effectively expressed: that the Church was a universal, absolutely necessary *cause* of salvation. This historical turn explains the type of explanation which first describes the Church as absolutely necessary and then develops principles which are incompatible with this view.

Nevertheless even after the works of Caperan and Bainvel, the manualists continued to describe the visible Church as a universal necessary cause of salvation. To be saved a man must be united to this Church either *in re* or *in voto*. For those united *in voto,* the *votum* was the most important single element among his dispositions. Explanations of this type are presented by Dorsch, d'Herbigny, Dieckmann and de Guibert, while among writers of a more popular type, the influence of the ideas of Bougaud, Caperan and Bainvel is clearly discernible. Sertillanges and Watkin viewed the Church as did Bougaud, as the society of those united to God in grace. Yet the influence of these works was insignificant compared to the tremendous influence exerted by Karl Adam. He has been hailed for re-vitalizing the concept of Church; but his description of the Church's necessity is a collection of the poorest features of Caperan and Bainvel. For Adam the Church is the ordinary means of salvation; there are extraordinary means whereby the grace of Christ can visit particular men "without the intervention of the Church." Such individuals belong to the soul of the Church, not to the body. There is here no absolute necessity for some union with the Church. Adam not only develops the weakest features of Caperan, but he directs the doctrine back to its pre-Vatican Council condition.

In regard to the *vestigia ecclesiae,* Adam differs sharply from Caperan. These elements are active *causes* of salvation. The Church possesses merely the fullness of the means of salvation, not all the means; not even in the sense that all means of salvation must be used in dependence upon her. Adam's position takes no account of the general approach of the school theologians and re-presents the explanation built upon a faulty concept of the soul of the Church. Both Caperan and Bainvel had rejected this concept; by 1926 it was no longer used by theologians, but by catechists, apologists and popularizers. That Adam should follow them and not the theologians is puzzling. The explanation lies perhaps in his concern for the fate of non-Catholics; in his eagerness to predicate as much good of them and their communions as possible; or in an inability to grant that the Church and the Church alone could *cause* the salvation of all men.

Ecumenists have whole-heartedly endorsed the teaching of Adam since it enables them to predicate much "catholicity" of our separated brethren. Yet how far removed this is from the position of Caperan! He strove to understand how the Church could influence the salvation of those who are not her members. He insisted upon the necessity of her influence. That he failed because of his concept of extraordinary means of salvation is lamentable; but the direction of his energies is clear. With Adam there comes the frank admission that non-Catholics are saved *because of* the good that exists in their communions. They are saved without the mediation of the Church. In an effort to avoid compromising the doctrine of the Church's necessity, Adam appeals to the Catholic origin of these *vestigia* and eventually invokes a faulty concept of the soul of the Church. Thus the period from Caperan in 1912 to Adam in 1926 was a critical one for the doctrine. The persistence with which the manualists adhered to the *in re-in voto* explanation ensured the continuance of the post-Conciliar trend. However they did not elaborate a penetrating concept of this *votum*. In addition there was some lack of uniformity in their explanation of the *votum*.

Felder believed the *votum* united a person to the soul of the Church. Herrman and Brunsmann thought it a substitute for the active influence of the Church. Schultes thought it was a disposition which merely merited for the person special graces from God. The majority of the manualists were content to state that the *votum* could be implicit in the will to do all God required. There was no indication regarding the nature of the *votum* beyond the statement that it was based upon faith and charity. This lacuna in the theological literature made it impossible to formulate an answer to the question which was Adam's concern: how can the Church save those who are not her members? In seeking an answer Adam did not follow the generally accepted *in re-in voto* explanation; rather he attempted to utilize the disparate elements which were at variance with this view.

Adam minimized the importance of the hierarchic institution through his pre-occupation with the invisible union of souls with Christ through grace. This union was effected without the aid of that hierarchic institution. Lippert and Karrer elaborated this view. Lippert destroyed the extension of the Church, expanding it until it included all men. Whoever possesses grace is a member of the Church; there is no man who is completely outside Christ's Church. For Karrer these individuals formed an invisible Church much wider and much more necessary than the visible Church. Taking up Adam's view of the *vestigia,* Karrer also accepts them as channels of grace. They are unconsciously related to the Church; there is here a subtle shift from the concept of individuals who are unconsciously related to the Church, to things, doctrines, parts of non-Catholic religions which possess this relation.

Central to this approach, which may be termed essentially "internalist," was the re-establishment of the body-soul distinction. The soul was composed of all those in the state of grace and included more members, or at least different members, than the Roman Catholic Church. This re-establishment came through the vigorously asserted theory that the Mystical Body of Christ contained only members who were in the state of grace. This was a different entity from the Roman Catholic Church. However Catholic theologians realized that these two entities could not be absolutely disparate. This was actually the Protestant doctrine of two churches. So it was necessary for Catholic theologians to describe the relation between these two entities so as to preserve the importance of the visible elements of the Church. The invisible depended for its existence on the visible; the visible alone contained the totality of the means of salvation. Such was as far as the assertions went. The subject of membership in the Church of Christ held the key and thus that status was divided into various degrees. Membership grew out of union with Christ in grace, baptism, and faith. Since the three elements were separable, a logical basis was established for distinguishing degrees of membership.

The absolute identification of the life-giving powers of Christ with the visible hierarchical Church was a concept not expressed by this section of theology, even though this concept had been the refinement of the theological process up to Caperan; a refinement which Caperan himself accepted, a refinement which continued to be made by the manualists. For at the time that Adam, Lippert and Karrer were receiving wide acceptance, Lercher was insisting upon the absolute necessity of union with the Church. This was the element which *caused salvation.* Goupil was saying it was nonsense to speak of a man as member of the Mystical Body if he was not a visible member of the Roman Catholic Church. Heris attributed all salvific power found on earth to the sacramental system and the ministry of the Catholic Church. The dichotomy between the two views is rather sharp. This was perhaps due to the formers' complete un-awareness that their position was a negation of the *in re-in voto* explanation. Else to their conviction that this latter view offered no hope of a deep understanding of the problem. To some the *votum ecclesiae* was just an empty phrase, not a supernatural reality.

The difference between the two views was widened even more by the writings of Congar, de Lubac and de Montcheuil. Congar saw the need of repudiating any distinction between a visible and an invisible Church. He investigated deeply the invisible, spiritual unity of the Church and bound that firmly to the visible ecclesiastical structure. This latter is the instrument of the former and supernatural life is communicated through this visible aspect. However, much of this is set aside and Congar presents a theory which differs but little from that of Adam and Lippert. For his unshaken conviction regarding the favorable spiritual condition of many non-Catholics led him to the practical conclusion that they are more truly members of the Mystical Body than perverse Catholics. The Mystical Body and the Church are not co-extensive. He supports Adam's view of the Catholic elements in non-Catholic religions, actually considering them "fibres of the Mystical Body," existing in an abnormal condition. Congar's over-emphasis of the spiritual union of men with Christ actually distorts the Catholic concept of Church. The Church as the "community of souls living the very life which is the life of the Blessed Trinity" is not the equivalent of the Roman Catholic Church.

Here again there is an inability to allow that all spiritual life can come only through the visible ecclesiastical structure. This leads to concepts which becloud the understanding of the Church's role in the salvation of men. To be sure this view is constructed against the understanding and acceptance of the *in re-in voto* explanation of the Church's necessity; but no spiritual reality is recognized in the *votum*.

De Lubac takes a different tack. He does not distort the concept of Church; but rather seeks to find a connection with the Church which can be predicated of all men. He does this by recognizing that all men are part of humanity which is to be saved, thus the Church is necessary for all men. The axiom is interpreted collectively: without the Church no salvation for humanity. The union of men with the Church is an ontological one, founded in the spiritual state which non-Catholics possess as a result of the Catholic elements which exist even in the most pagan religions. These elements can be effective, because of this existence of the full Christian dispensation in the Church, and because these elements cry out for completion in that fullness. Consequently men vivified by these elements attain a relation or union to the Church and so are not saved *apart from the Church.*

For de Montcheuil the Church's task is to transform all that is good in humanity; therefore whoever works for the accomplishment of an human value in the real sense of the word, is working for the same goal as the Church and thus is entitled to the reward which the Church dispenses: salvation.

From the time of Caperan the manualists have clung to the *in re-in voto* explanation highlighting the *votum* as the necessary element. Some union with the ecclesiastical structure was necessary because it was only in and through this visible society that God granted the graces of salvation. Verbally accepting this doctrine, a stream of writers has endeavored to give an adequate answer to the vexing question: how can the Church effect the salvation of those who are not actually her members? They have emphasized the importance of the invisible aspects of the Church, they have distinguished between the visible and the invisible Church, they have regarded the Mystical Body as wider than the Church, they have accepted the *vestigia ecclesiae* as means of salvation, they have searched for an ontological union of all men with the Church, simply because they are part of the human race, or because they are working for the same goal as the Church. All of these orientations are irreconcilable with the description of the Church as an absolutely necessary means of salvation. Concern over at least some of these tentatives was voiced by Pius XII in 1939 when he denied the distinction between the juridic church and the church of charity. These were not two entities but one. This statement made to the seminarists of Rome was an earnest of the encyclical which was to appear four years later and was to take a stand directly opposed to many of the views recorded above.

The encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* made it clear that the visible and the invisible elements of the Church are but aspects of the same reality. The Mystical Body is the Roman Catholic Church. So complete is this identification that a man can be endowed with supernatural life only through the Church's visible structure. Thus the encyclical implicitly endorses the teaching which the manualists have preserved. Such a teaching makes it possible to maintain that a man may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church, or to an invisible Church, or to the Mystical Body but not the Roman Catholic Church. These explanations separate elements which the encyclical has insisted are identified. Nor can it be said that the necessity of the Church is only one of precept, that the Church is only the ordinary way of salvation, that it is sufficient for salvation to be in the state of grace, that there are exceptions to the Church's necessity, that God is not bound by His ordinances. For all these assertions do not sufficiently contain the absolute necessity of some union with the Roman Catholic Church. Thus the recurrent attempt, evident from the time of Caperan, to justify an authentic supernatural life existing apart from any dependence upon the visible Roman Catholic Church, is strongly reproved by the encyclical. The convergence of the encyclical's teaching is upon the point that union with the Roman Catholic Church is absolutely necessary. In two separate texts, the encyclical implicitly uses the *in re-in voto* distinction to describe the possible modes of that unity.

However there was not universal agreement that this actually was the teaching of the encyclical. Some theologians warned against a return to a dry, sterile, externalized perspective of the Church. They continued to introduce distinctions between the Mystical Body and the Church, particularly in regard to their extension. They defended that use of the body-soul distinction wherein the soul was more extensive than the body. Since the visible Church was beyond the reach of many men, they described a spiritual, cosmic universality of the Church. They gave the encyclical's teaching regarding union with the Church a particularly intense scrutiny. To some, the term "*ordinentur*" signified a new orientation, a more profound and fundamentally different approach to the whole question. It seemed to indicate a union which was predicable of all men. Finally the distinctions made in regard to the encyclical's definition of membership in the Church were almost without number.

All of this was tragic, particularly for the doctrine of the Church's necessity. It failed to weigh sufficiently the basic view of the encyclical that some union with the Church was necessary. For by its identification of the Church and the Mystical Body, the encyclical gathered all the penetrating theological speculation concerning the supernatural reality of the Church, gave it an authoritative and profound elaboration and bound all this supernatural reality firmly and inseparably to the Church as visible society. This had been the central point emphasized by the traditional *in re-in voto* explanation of the Church's necessity and it was this vital consideration which was overlooked by the continued "internalist" interpretation of the encyclical. All that had been said about the supernatural reality of the Church was true and valid, but it was not referable to an invisible Church, a Church of charity, a Mystical Body wider than the Roman Catholic Church; nor to a Church with a universal invisible spiritual extension. It was referable completely and solely to the existing society which is the Roman Catholic Church, a society whose extension is circumscribed by the essentially visible character of its membership.

Furthermore the whole concept of Church, the whole determination of man's union with the Church depends upon a firm acceptance of the encyclical definition of membership in terms of external characteristics. If union with Christ through sanctifying grace is regarded as essentially constituting membership in His Church, the perspective will be reversed. It will be necessary then to predicate membership of all those who possess sanctifying grace yet lack the conditions required by the encyclical. The extension of the Church will be greatly enlarged. Also membership in the Church will then be a result of immediate union with Christ. This would eliminate the Church as a necessary cause of salvation.

Humani Generis repudiated this "internalist" interpretation once more by insisting upon the identity of the Church and the Mystical Body. It further complained that some authors were explaining the doctrine of the Church's necessity in such a way as to reduce it to a meaningless formula. The combined teaching of these two encyclicals calls theologians back to the absolute view maintained by the manualists and labels as incorrect all theories which are a denial of that position. *Suprema haec sacra* confirmed this by taking an absolute view of the doctrine, understanding the Church as a means "without which no one can enter the Kingdom of eternal glory." *Humani Generis* along with *Suprema haec sacra* has shown that the use of *ordinentur* in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* did not constitute a refinement of the traditional *pertinere in voto*. Internal evaluation of the text supports this conclusion, since the persons of whom this relation are predicated can attain salvation. Therefore their status is the same as that previously described by theologians as "pertaining to the Church in desire." Only to one who does not recognize the validity of the concept of an implicit *votum* can the text present any difficulty. Furthermore if *ordinentur* did mark a new departure, the later documents have not continued it. *Humani Generis* speaks of the *necessitatem pertinendi ad veram Ecclesiam. Suprema haec sacra* uses *ordinentur* and *adhaereat* as equivalent terms. The most recent manuals—Zapelena, Mors, Salaverri—have continued using *pertinere in voto.* There seems no basis therefore for reading out of *ordinentur* some universal attachment to the Church on the part of every human individual.

One concept which has been proposed even after *Humani Generis* and *Suprema haec sacra* is that of a cosmic universality of the Church. This actually removes any necessity for union with the Church. It stems from a misinterpretation of the teaching of St. Thomas. Certainly there is a universal *relatio in potentia* of all men to the Mystical Body. But this relation must be actualized in some way, else it can have no effect upon the salvation of anyone. Any attempt to over-emphasize this relation so as to bring all men within the Church must be regarded as basically incorrect. Such a methodology gives the Church a universal extension. It prescinds from the importance of personal dispositions and predicates of all men that degree of union with the Church which is necessary for salvation.

Though this large area of precision has been brought to the doctrine by the magisterium, the question of "belonging to the Church" remains a vexing one. There are persistent attempts to predicate some attenuated membership of those who are saved without actually fulfilling all the requirements for membership mentioned by Pope Pius XII. In current literature a multitude of degrees are mentioned: members *in re,* members *in voto,* initial members, incomplete members, invisible members, perfect visible members and perfect invisible members, incomplete invisible members. There is also belonging to the Church, pertaining to the Church, ordained to the Church, related to the Church. The complex entanglements of this question have not yet been unraveled.

No presumption is made to do so here. However on the basis of the present historical study and with the present magisterial understanding of the doctrine of the Church's necessity, it is possible to indicate tenets which should form an essential part of future theological discussion. For the understanding of the axiom of the Church's necessity is now most clear. *Suprema haec sacra* sees union with the Church as absolutely necessary for salvation. That union may be had in two and only two ways: by actual membership or by being united to the Church in desire. This postulates two conclusions: 1. Membership signifies the technical status described by Pope Pius XII in the encyclical *Mystical Corporis*. 2. Union in desire is a union based upon the possession of the virtue of supernatural faith and charity. It would seem necessary also to admit a third conclusion: not every union with the Church is either membership or union in desire. These three principles can bring charity to a question which has often been confused by many meaningless distinctions.

First the concept of membership is precisely that defined by Pope Pius XII. The term member was used very carefully in the encyclical and not applied to those who lacked the necessary visible bonds. Membership is thus an indivisible reality, present only when all the conditions mentioned by the Holy Father are verified. Partial fulfillment of these conditions does not bestow partial membership in Christ's Mystical Body. This is the view defended by Brunet, Fenton, Strotmann and Vodopivec. It is a necessary position, otherwise the unique status of member is compromised. A member of Christ's Mystical Body is not merely a person united to God through Christ; but a person who is united to Christ in a special way. He is united as a part of the juridical society which alone is the Mystical Body of Christ. This is a specific manner of justification. It is a special type of union with Christ and it is found only in members of the Catholic Church. It is a preferred position, modally distinct from the condition of those who are united to Christ without being his members. The mode is juridical insertion in the Roman Catholic Church and vivification by the Holy Spirit Who is the Soul of the Church. Without this, the status of membership cannot exist. Strange though it may seem, wherever this juridical insertion exists, the status of membership exists—even though there be an absence of union with Christ through sanctifying grace. Such a person, because of faith and hope, is not "deprived of all life." He still remains a part of the Church. Thus the Church is always co-terminous with the determination of its membership. Any dilation of the concept of membership can result only in a distortion of the concept of Church.

Secondly the term *votum ecclesiae* signifies a status which is a most profound spiritual and supernatural reality. When it is said that a person pertains to the Church in desire, this means that he is in possession of divine faith and charity; that he has with the visible Roman Catholic Church a true attachment through which the graces of Christ reach him. As *Suprema haec sacra* explains, he is truly using the necessary means of salvation, but he is using it only in desire. This status is enough of a reality to enable the person to be considered "within" the Church though he does not become a member of the Church because juridical insertion is not present. Here lies the very heart of the proper understanding of the Church necessity. Only the *votum ecclesiae* can explain how the Church actually procures salvation for the millions of men who are to all outward appearances alien to her. This *votum* is a spiritual reality; it is not membership. If either of these facts is overlooked, the result will be confusion and inaccuracy.

It is possible to present the *in re-in voto* explanation in such a way that the *votum* is described merely as a result of sanctification, a sanctification which was attained in complete independence of the Church. This is inaccurate. There is no justification without faith and charity; but for one who is not actually a member of the Church, the *votum ecclesiae* is the indispensable *id quo caritas justificat*. As the Council of Trent insisted that justification is not to be attributed to contrition without the *votum sacramenti* which is included in it, so too we can say that the justification and salvation of a non-Catholic is not to be attributed to any disposition or any combination of dispositions, independently of the *votum ecclesiae*. This for him constitutes a true utilization of the one general means of salvation; this truly places him within the Church in a salvific way. Without this disposition nothing can be of any salvific value for him.

It is equally necessary to distinguish this status from membership in the Church. For the extension of the Church is commensurate with its membership. Members are parts of the Church. If those possessing the *votum* are called members the extension of the Church is adversely effected; if they are styled partial members, invisible members, etc., the extension of the Church is made indistinct. Its limits are blurred. Those possessing the *votum* are not partly in and partly out of the Church. They are in the Church, but in a way different from members. Here it is not merely a matter of visible and invisible presence in the Church. There is no invisible Church, so there can be no invisible members. Those possessing the *votum* are in the Church in a way that is totally distinct from the status of membership. They are not parts of the juridical structure; they have no juridical insertion in Christ's Mystical Body. Hence they cannot be his members. Nevertheless they are "within" the Church because their will is there. Because *"apud Deum votum pro facto reputatur,"* they are truly present in the Church in a salvific way and so can benefit from the mediation of the Church. They are vivified by the Holy Spirit because of the tenuous but true union they have with the Body of Christ. This is not an attempt to give a new meaning to the old word "extra." It is simply a conclusion forced upon them by the full realization, according to the *analogia fidei,* of what the Church's understanding of this dogmatic word has always been.

Thirdly, not every real bond with the Church is necessarily either membership or the *votum ecclesiae*. This distinction which Vodopivec stresses provides theology with the means to bring the discussion of "belonging to the Church" to a conclusion. For example, a validly baptized non-Catholic, after reaching the use of reason, ceases to be a member of the Church if he does not reenter the Catholic unity. However, by faith and charity he can still pertain to the Church in desire. Should he fall into serious sin, even this relation with the Church will cease; but he will still retain some union with the Church. He will possess the character of baptism. This is a status which should not be described as an initial, partial, incomplete membership. It is simply a bond of union with the Church which is neither membership nor the *votum ecclesiae*. It is a bond which can be the basis for a *votum,* even the basis for membership but *de facto* it does not amount to either. This principle is not as clearly contained in the magisterial explanations as are the first two, yet it seems as necessary. No one can deny the existence of these bonds. Yet if they are confused with membership, that very status is obscured; the Church's extension is affected. If they are equated with the *votum ecclesiae,* then that status is reduced to something which can be predicated of a high segment of humanity apart from their doing anything personally to attain it.

Guided by these three principles, theologians can investigate the question of the *vestigia ecclesiae,* determining how they can be the basis for the *votum ecclesiae.* They will not attempt to make these *vestigia* means of salvation in themselves. Theologians can investigate mankind's *relatio in potentia* to the Mystical Body and its role in preparing for either the *votum* or the status of membership. There will be no need to defend a cosmic universality of the Church, or secret prolongations of the Church. Proper understanding of the *votum* will show that it is not so much a question of the Church expanding to reach men but of men journeying to reach the Church. This journey is within the ability of everyone who possesses a human will. He can enter the Church in desire. Nor will there be any need to introduce a cruel dissection between the body and soul of the Church in order to make her accessible to all men.

These three principles then would seem to be a necessary starting point for theologians seeking to explain how the Church can effect the salvation of those not her members. In addition they could also weigh factors which have been only scantily considered: the role of the sacrifice of the Mass, the dedicated lives of the Catholic clergy, the heroic lives of so many religious, especially the contemplatives, the prayers, good works, suffering of all the members of the Mystical Body.

There would seem then little justification for any but the *in re-in voto* explanation; continued use of inadequate explanations can only hamper the work still to be done: the complete elaboration of the nature and foundation of the *votum ecclesiae.* Only by penetrating the reality of the *votum* can theology silence the recurrent demand that it is necessary to acknowledge some salvific power in non-Catholic institutions. By observing the three principles given above, theology can prevent this development from lapsing into the gravely damaging theories advanced during the past century.

CONCLUSIONS

1. During the last century the explanations of the Church's necessity for salvation have incorporated many elements which seem to be inexact. Discretion is needed in quoting the explanations found in some older theological works.
2. The magisterial documents of Pius IX and Pius XII regard some union with the Church as an absolutely necessary prerequisite for salvation. This union must be either actual membership in the Roman Catholic Church or the possession of the *votum ecclesiae*.
3. The best explanation of the doctrine of the Church's necessity and also the only one which has received explicit approval by the magisterium is that which states that the Church is necessary for salvation both with the necessity of means and the necessity of precept. To be saved a man must be united to the Church either really or in desire. The former is the status of membership, the latter constitutes the *votum ecclesiae*. This *votum* is sufficient to place a man within the Church without making him a member. It is a true disposition of will, founded on the possession of supernatural faith and charity whereby a non-Catholic in invincible ignorance comes into salvific contact with the Church. This *votum* may be either explicit or implicit in the general disposition to do all God requires.
4. The explanation which states that a man may be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church though not to the body, cannot be reconciled with the statements of the magisterium.
5. The explanation which describes the Church merely as the ordinary way of salvation is inadequate.
6. The explanation which sees in the necessity of the Church only a necessity of precept is inadequate.
7. The explanation which sees only a necessity for membership in an invisible Church is inadequate.
8. The explanation which merely states that a man who is invincibly ignorant of the Catholic Church may be saved by the possession of sanctifying grace is inadequate.

9. The explanation which combines the body-soul and the *in re-in voto* distinctions would seem to be inadequate. This view states that it is necessary to belong to the soul of the Church *in re* and the body of the Church at least *in voto*. Besides making a cleavage in the unity of the Church, this explanation tends to describe the union with the body of the Church as a result of union with the soul. Thus it does not clearly describe the Roman Catholic Church as a cause of salvation. This explanation involves also an inexact concept of the soul of the Church.

10. The elements which have come to be called *vestigia ecclesiae* must not be described as means of salvation in themselves apart from any causality on the part of the *votum ecclesiae*.

11. The word "Church" signifies the Roman Catholic Church with its visible membership and its definite, visible, accurately discernible extension. To ascribe any other meaning to "Church" in the interpretation of "outside the Church no salvation," is inexact.

12. In regard to the terminology to be employed in describing man's relation to the Church the following conclusions seem justified:

a. Membership is a technical status, predicable only of those who fulfill all the conditions mentioned by Pope Pius XII in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*.

b. Qualification of the term member (v.g. invisible member, initial member, imperfect member) should be recognized as an improper way of speaking. If such terms are used it should be made clear that they do not signify the real true status of membership. The only qualification of membership which remains a proper use is that of living and dead members. This latter qualification is based upon the fact that membership is a perfectible, not a divisible status.

c. The expression "pertaining to the Church in desire" should be used to indicate that the person possesses the salvific *votum* based upon faith and charity.

d. There is possible a degree of union with the Church which constitutes neither the status of membership nor the *votum salvificum*.

INDEX OF NAMES

Adam, K., 141, 161-169, 197
Anouilh, P., 69
Aubert, R., 19, 170

Bainvel, J. V., 116-120, 131-139, 147, 158, 185, 229
Bellarmine, St. Robert, 272
Beni, A., 318
Berry, S., 171
Besson, Mgr., 12-13, 15, 187
Billot, L., 16, 94-95
Blanch, M., 100
Bonal, A., 14-15, 173
Bougard, E., 44-50
Boulenger, A., 155
Bouyer, L., 283, 285
de Brouwer, F., 44
Brugere, L., 33-34
Brunet, R., 329-330
Brunsmann, J., 157-158

Calcagno, F. X., 285
Caperan, L., x, 116, 119-131, 173, 185
Carrigan, J., 258-262
Casajoana, V., 68-69
Cassanova, G., 99
Castelein, A., 96-98
Castelot, J., 331
Castillon, P., 93
Cercia, R., 5, 15
Chavasse, A., 271-275, 315
Chère, J., 50-51
Christiani, L., 142
Cipriani, S., 318
Congar, M. J., x, 170, 200-219
Constantin, C., 16
Coppin, P., 96-98
Crosta, C., 93

Danielou, J., 262
David, G., 75
Delogne, H., 230
Denis, H., 315
Denis, L., 300
Desers, L., 100
Dieckmann, H., 158
Dorsch, A., 142
Dublanchy, E., 66, 77-85, 90
Dumont, P., 255
Duplessy, E., 157

Egger, F., 69

Falcon, J., 182-184
Felder, M., 150
Fenton, J. C., 23, 26, 268-271, 294 note, 306 note, 307-308
Fraghi, S., 187
Frenzelin, J. B., Card., x, 29, 58-66, 173
Frisque, J., 315, 325-329

Gossuet, C., 5, 14, 15, 29
Goupil, A., 174
Goyau, G., 178
de Groot, J. V., 70-71
Gruden, J., 228
de Guibert, J., 160
Gutti, V., 14-15

Hales, E., 24
Hasseveldt, R., 265
Hayward, F., 16, 19
d'Herbigny, M., 121, 143-145
Heris, C. V., 176-177
Herrmann, J., 158-160
Hervé, J., 142
Hettinger, F., 8-9, 14-15
Hocedez, E., 3, 18-19
Holstein, H., 295-301
Hugon, E., 91, 106-113, 116, 185-186
Hugueny, E., 117
Humani Generis, Encyclical letter of Pope Pius XII, 289-291
Humanum Genus, Encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII, 307
Hunter, S., 76
Hurter, H., 39-40

Jansen, G., 37-38
Jolivert, R., 178
Journet, C., 301-307

Karrer, O., 188-198
Kosters, L., 186-187

Labeyrie, C., 101
Labourt, J., 117
Lahargou, P., 171
Lambrecht, H., 71
Lammenais, F., 18

Lateran Council, the fourth, 269
Laxenaire, J., 101
Leboucher, A., 42-44
Lecanuet, E., 18
Lepicier, A., 186
Lercher, L., 172, 258
Lesetre, H., 117
Liegé, P. A., 278-283, 322-325
Lippert, P., 178-181
Lombardi, R., 234-237
de Lubac, H., 219-228

MacGuiness, I., 266 note
Magnasco, S., 39
Malvy, P. A., 329
de Mandato, P., 92
Mannens, P., 99
Marchini, A., 95
Marengo, J., 76
Marotte, L. P., 37
Masl, M., 173
Mathew, A. H., 107
Mathieu, H., 185
Mazzella, C., 43
Mazzella, O., 101-102
Mendive, P., 77
Michalon, P., 263-265
Michelitsch, A., 105
Moehler, J. B., x
Montalembert, C., 18
de Montcheuil, Y., 238-245
Morel, V., 275-278
Morere, B., 51
Mors, J., x, 330-331
Moulard, A., 116
Muncunill, J., 141-142
Murphy, J., 308-310
Murphy, W., 331
Murray, P., x, 5-8, 14-15, 29
Mystici Corporis, Encyclical letter of Pope Pius XII, 251-255

Naulerts, J., 118-119
Nègre, A., 92
Newman, J. H., 34-37
Nostis et nobiscum, Encyclical letter of Pope Pius IX, 24
Nothomb, D. M., 310-313

Orain, 92
Ottiger, I., 117-118

Palmieri, D., 40-41
Parente, P., 265
Paris, G., 176
Perreyve, H., 10, 14-15
Perriot, F., 39
Perrone, J., x, 3-4, 11-12
Pesch, C., 53-55
Philips, G., 263
Poizat, A., 100
Pollet, R., 185
Postquam Dei munere, Bull of Pope Pius IX, 30
Prevel, P., 118
Prunel, L., 146-148

Quanto conficiamur coerere, Encyclical letter of Pope Pius IX, xii, 3, 17, 24-28

Reinerding, F., 11, 15
Reinhold, G., 106
Ruiz, V., 107
Russo, N., 55-56

St. John, H., 320-321
Sala, F., 99
Salaverri, J., x, 300
de San, L., 107
Schanz, P., 66-68
Schiffini, S., 116
Schouppe, 13-15
Schraeder, C., 8, 29
Sermo ad alumnos seminariorum . . . , Pope Pius XII, 237
Sertillanges, A., 145-146
Shea, F., 331
Singulari quadam, Encyclical letter of Pope Pius IX, xii, 3, 17, 19-22, 83, 269
Souben, J., 105-106
Stoltz, A., 230
Straub, A., 71-75
Strotmann, T., 302, 313-314
Stummer, A., 107
Suarez, 272
Suprema haec sacra, Holy Office letter to the Archbishop of Boston, 291-295

Tanquerey, A., 91
Tepe, B., 76-77
Texier, A., 230
Tromp, A., x, 253, 255

Unam Sanctam, Bull of Pope Boniface VIII, 242 note, 269

Van Laak, H., 117-118
Van Noort, G., 102-104, 332

Vatican Council, 30-33, *229*
Vellico, P., *237-238*
Verhelst, M., 148-149
Vincent, F., 116
Vodopivec, J., 333-338

Walker, L., 150-151
Watkin, E. I., 151-154
Wilmers, W., 93

Zapelena, T., x, 302 note, 306 note, 318-320
Zigliara, T., 71
Zubizarreta, V., 175-176

DATE DUE

DEC 11 [illegible]

~~JAN [illegible]~~

~~OCT 18 1999~~

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01019 8739